

Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies: FY2012 Appropriations

Updated December 8, 2011

Congressional Research Service

<https://crsreports.congress.gov>

R41721

Summary

This report provides an overview of actions taken by Congress to provide FY2012 appropriations for Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies (CJS) accounts.

On November 18, 2011, President Obama signed into law the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (P.L. 112-55), which includes the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (Division B). The act includes \$60.91 billion for CJS, of which \$7.808 billion is for the Department of Commerce, \$27.408 billion is for the Department of Justice, \$24.838 billion is for the science agencies, and \$856.6 million is for the related agencies.

On November 1, 2011, the Senate passed an amended version of H.R. 2112, which included the Senate's proposed funding for the agencies and bureaus funded as part of the annual CJS appropriations bill. H.R. 2112, as passed by the Senate, would have provided \$60.664 billion for CJS. This included \$8.192 billion for the Department of Commerce, \$26.925 billion for the Department of Justice, \$24.643 billion for the science agencies, and \$903.9 million for the related agencies.

On July 20, 2011, the House Committee on Appropriations reported the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (H.R. 2596). The bill would have provided a total of \$57.949 billion for CJS. The bill included \$7.161 billion for the Department of Commerce, \$26.323 billion for the Department of Justice, \$23.649 billion for the science agencies, and \$814.8 million for the related agencies.

For FY2012, the Administration requested a total of \$64.93 billion for the agencies and bureaus funded as part of the annual CJS appropriations bill. The Administration's FY2012 request included \$8.761 billion for the Department of Commerce, \$28.68 billion for the Department of Justice, \$26.498 billion for the science agencies, and \$991.4 million for the related agencies.

On April 15, 2011, President Obama signed into law the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 112-10). The act provided a total of \$61.092 billion for agencies and bureaus funded as part of the annual appropriations for CJS for FY2011. The \$61.092 billion provided by the act includes \$7.578 billion for the Department of Commerce, \$27.281 billion for the Department of Justice, \$25.315 billion for the science agencies, and \$917.9 million for the related agencies.

The source for the FY2011-enacted amounts, the FY2012-requested amounts, and the House Committee on Appropriations-recommended amounts is H.Rept. 112-169. The Senate-passed amounts were taken from H.R. 2112, as passed by the Senate. FY2012-enacted amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-284.

Contents

Most Recent Developments.....	1
FY2012 Appropriations.....	1
Survey of Selected Issues	3
Department of Commerce	3
Department of Justice (DOJ).....	4
Science Agencies.....	5
Related Agencies	5
Department of Commerce	6
FY2011 and FY2012 Appropriations	7
International Trade Administration (ITA)	9
Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS).....	9
Economic Development Administration (EDA)	10
Minority Business Development Agency (MBDA)	13
Economic and Statistics Administration (ESA)	13
Bureau of the Census	14
National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA).....	16
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)	17
National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).....	17
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).....	18
Department of Justice	20
FY2011 and FY2012 Appropriations	21
General Administration	24
General Administration.....	25
Administrative Review and Appeals (ARA).....	25
Office of the Federal Detention Trustee (OFDT).....	26
Office of the Inspector General (OIG).....	26
U.S. Parole Commission	26
Legal Activities	27
General Legal Activities	27
Office of the U.S. Attorneys.....	27
Other Legal Activities	28
U.S. Marshals Service (USMS)	28
National Security Division (NSD)	29
Interagency Law Enforcement	29
Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)	30
Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA).....	33
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF).....	33
Multiple Rifle Sales Reports	35
Operation Fast and Furious	36
Importability of Certain Shotguns	38
Other Possible Oversight Issues.....	39
Federal Prison System (Bureau of Prisons).....	39
Office on Violence Against Women (OVW)	41
Office of Justice Programs (OJP)	43
Justice Assistance.....	44
State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance	45

Juvenile Justice Programs	49
Public Safety Officers Benefits Program (PSOB)	50
Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS)	51
Salaries and Expenses for OVW, OJP, and COPS.....	53
Science Agencies	53
FY2011 and FY2012 Appropriations	53
Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP)	54
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)	56
National Science Foundation (NSF)	58
Related Agencies	62
Commission on Civil Rights	63
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)	64
U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC).....	65
Legal Services Corporation (LSC).....	65
Marine Mammal Commission (MMC)	67
Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR).....	67
State Justice Institute (SJI).....	67

Tables

Table 1. CJS Appropriations, FY2011-Enacted, FY2012 Request, House Committee on Appropriations Reported, Senate-Passed and FY2012-Enacted	3
Table 2. Funding for the Department of Commerce.....	8
Table 3. EDA Programs and Salaries and Expenses: FY2012.....	12
Table 4. Funding for the Department of Justice	23
Table 5. Funding for OVW Programs	42
Table 6. Funding for Justice Assistance Programs	45
Table 7. Funding for State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs.....	46
Table 8. Funding for Juvenile Justice Programs.....	50
Table 9. Funding for Community Oriented Policing Services Programs	52
Table 10. Funding for Science Agencies	54
Table 11. Funding for NASA.....	58
Table 12. Funding for Related Agencies	63
Table 13. Funding for CJS Agencies, by Account, FY2008-FY2012	69

Contacts

Author Information.....	72
-------------------------	----

Most Recent Developments

On November 18, 2011, President Obama signed into law the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (P.L. 112-55), which includes the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (Division B). The act includes \$60.91 billion for CJS, of which \$7.808 billion is for the Department of Commerce, \$27.408 billion is for the Department of Justice, \$24.838 billion is for the science agencies, and \$856.6 million is for the related agencies.

FY2012 Appropriations

This report provides an overview of actions taken by Congress to provide FY2012 appropriations for CJS accounts. It also provides an overview of FY2011 appropriations for agencies and bureaus funded as a part of the annual appropriation for CJS. The source for the FY2011-enacted amounts, the FY2012-requested amounts, and the House Committee on Appropriations-recommended amounts is H.Rept. 112-169. The Senate-passed amounts were taken from H.R. 2112, as passed by the Senate. FY2012-enacted amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-284.

The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 includes a total of \$60.91 billion for the bureaus and agencies funded as a part of the act. The FY2012-enacted amount is 0.4% more than what would have been provided by the Senate-passed CJS bill and 5.1% more than what the House Committee on Appropriations recommended for CJS. However, the FY2012-enacted amount is 6.3% below the Administration's request for CJS and 0.5% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. The act includes \$7.808 billion for the Department of Commerce, \$27.408 billion for the Department of Justice, \$24.838 billion for the science agencies, and \$856.6 million for the related agencies.

The Senate amended the House-passed version of H.R. 2112, which originally was the appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies, to include appropriations for CJS. The Senate-passed version of the bill would have provided a total of \$60.664 billion for the bureaus and agencies funded by the bill. The Senate-passed amount was 4.7% more than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, but it was 6.7% below the Administration's request and 0.9% less than the FY2011-enacted appropriation. The bill included \$8.192 billion for the Department of Commerce, \$26.925 billion for the Department of Justice, \$24.643 billion for the science agencies, and \$903.9 million for the related agencies.

H.R. 2596 would have provided a total of \$57.949 billion for CJS. The amount recommended by the committee was 10.9% less than the Administration's FY2012 request for CJS and 5.3% below the FY2011-enacted level. The bill included \$7.161 billion for the Department of Commerce, \$26.323 billion for the Department of Justice, \$23.649 billion for the science agencies, and \$814.8 million for the related agencies. During the committee's markup of the bill, the committee adopted an amendment that increased funding for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA's) Operations, Research, and Facilities account by \$48.0 million. The increase was offset by applying a 0.1% rescission to all other discretionary accounts in the bill. The amounts included in this report reflect the 0.1% rescission even though the committee's bill and report did not include the rescinded amounts.

For FY2012, the Administration requested a total of \$64.93 billion for the agencies and bureaus funded as a part of the annual CJS appropriations bill. The FY2012 request was \$3.839 billion, or 6.3%, more than the FY2011-enacted amount of \$61.092 billion. The Administration's FY2012

request included \$8.761 billion for the Department of Commerce, \$28.68 billion for the Department of Justice, \$26.498 billion for the science agencies, and \$991.4 million for the related agencies.

The Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 112-10) provided a total of \$61.092 billion for CJS, which includes \$7.578 billion for the Department of Commerce, \$27.281 billion for the Department of Justice, \$25.315 billion for the science agencies, and \$917.9 million for the related agencies.

The amounts in this report reflect only new budget authority. Therefore, the amounts do not include any rescissions of unobligated or deobligated balances that may be counted as offsets to newly enacted budget authority.

Table 1 shows the FY2011-enacted appropriations, the Administration's FY2012 request, the House Committee on Appropriations-recommended appropriations, the Senate-passed, and the FY2012-enacted appropriations for the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, the science agencies, and the related agencies.

A Note on the Budget Control Act of 2011¹

The FY2012 appropriations bills are the first that are affected by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (P.L. 112-25), which established discretionary security and non-security spending caps for FY2012 and FY2013, and overall caps that will govern the actions of appropriations committees in both houses. In FY2012, the BCA sets a separate cap of \$684 billion for security spending, defined to include the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs, Budget Function 150 for all international affairs programs, the National Nuclear Security Administration, and the Intelligence Community Management Account that funds the offices of the Director of National Intelligence. All other spending is capped at \$359 billion out of the total of \$1.043 trillion. In addition, the BCA allows for adjustments that would raise the statutory caps to cover funding for overseas contingency operations/Global War on Terror, emergency spending, and, to a limited extent, disaster relief and appropriations for continuing disability reviews and for controlling health care fraud and abuse.

This report does not reflect the scorekeeping adjustments that may bring the total budget authority provided in the appropriations proposals in line with the BCA caps and the 302(a) and 302(b) allocations.

¹ For more information on the Budget Control Act (P.L. 112-25), see CRS Report R41965, *The Budget Control Act of 2011*, by Bill Heniff Jr., Elizabeth Rybicki, and Shannon M. Mahan.

Table 1. CJS Appropriations, FY2011-Enacted, FY2012 Request, House Committee on Appropriations Reported, Senate-Passed and FY2012-Enacted
(budget authority in millions of dollars)

Departments and Related Agencies	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Request	House Committee Reported	Senate-Passed	FY2012 Enacted
Department of Commerce	\$7,580.9	\$8,802.6	\$7,161.3	\$8,191.7	\$7,807.7
Department of Justice	27,389.2	28,724.3	26,323.3	26,925.3	27,407.7
Science Agencies	25,314.5	26,498.0	23,649.5	24,642.9	24,837.6
Related Agencies	917.9	991.4	814.8	903.9	856.6
Total	61,202.5^a	65,016.3^b	57,948.9^c	60,663.7^d	60,909.6^e

Source: FY2011-enacted amounts, FY2012-requested amounts, and House committee-reported amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-169. Senate-passed amounts were taken from H.R. 2112, as passed by the Senate. FY2012-enacted amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-284.

Notes: Amounts may not add to totals due to rounding. The House committee-reported amounts include the 0.1% rescission specified in Section 543 of H.R. 2596.

- a. This amount does not include \$2.416 billion in rescissions of unobligated balances.
- b. This amount does not include a proposed \$839.7 million in rescissions of unobligated balances.
- c. This amount does not include a proposed \$1.053 billion in rescissions of unobligated balances.
- d. This amount does not include a proposed \$829.7 million in rescissions of unobligated balances.
- e. This amount does not include \$905.9 million in rescissions of unobligated balances.

Survey of Selected Issues

Department of Commerce

Congress considered the following issues as part of the Department of Commerce FY2012 appropriations process:

- whether to fund the Obama Administration's proposed 17.2% increase in funding for the International Trade Administration for FY2012 as part of the Administration's goal of doubling exports over the next five years through the National Export Initiative;
- oversight of the President's Export Control Reform Initiative—under the Bureau of Industry and Security—the end goal of which is to create a single licensing authority for both dual-use and munitions exports;
- whether to approve, as a cost-control measure, the Administration's proposed termination of two Census Bureau programs: (1) the Statistical Abstract Program, which would eliminate both the print and online versions of *Statistical Abstract*, as well as the *County and City Data Book*, *State and Metropolitan Area Data Book*, and USA Counties Web database; and (2) the Federal Financial Statistics Program, which would terminate the *Consolidated Federal Funds Report*;
- whether to provide the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office with the authority to use all the fees it collects in a fiscal year;

- whether to continue and expand support for the extramural programs of the National Institute of Standards and Technology aimed at the development of “pre-competitive” generic technologies;
- whether to approve the proposed establishment of a Climate Service line office and the related changes to the administrative structure of NOAA;
- whether to accept the Administration’s proposal to transfer funds from public works to economic adjustment assistance under the Economic Development Administration to help distressed areas affected by unemployment as a result of the recession;
- funding levels and oversight of the new inter-agency Regional Innovation Program, a proposal for a new national competition to identify 20 growth zones across the country;
- whether to increase funding for the activities and outreach of the Minority Business Development Agency’s (MBDA’s) Office of Native American Business Development to support research on Native American trade promotion and economic disparities, and whether to increase funding for MBDA to monitor and provide technical assistance for minority businesses seeking federal contracts; and
- whether to accept the Administration’s proposal to omit expenditures for Public Telecommunications Facilities, Planning and Construction from the National Telecommunications and Information Administration budget. In 2010, Congress provided \$20.0 million for the program and omitted it in the 2011-enacted budget.

Department of Justice (DOJ)

Some issues Congress might have considered while determining funding levels for DOJ accounts include the following:

- the extent to which DOJ as a whole and its components have prepared to respond to potential weapons of mass destruction (WMD) incidents under the National Response Framework;
- whether certain functions of the National Drug Intelligence Center (NDIC) are redundant with duties of other federal agencies, and consequently, whether funding for the NDIC should be adjusted accordingly;
- whether to increase funding for the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force (OCDETF) program to enhance investigations and prosecutions along the Southwest border;
- the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI’s) progress in developing a computerized case management system for investigations known as Sentinel, which is behind schedule and over budget;
- the rate at which the FBI has utilized funding and staffing resources for national security matters and other national priorities (counterterrorism, counterintelligence, cybercrime, and civil rights), as compared to traditional crime matters (organized crime, gangs, drug-related crime, white collar crime, and violent crime);

- the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives' (ATF's) efforts to reduce gun trafficking across the Southwest border to Mexico under Project Gunrunner and the bureau's efforts to share criminal intelligence with the Department of Homeland Security;
- efforts made by DOJ, FBI, and ATF to harmonize overlapping, interagency jurisdictions over criminal matters related to explosives;
- the ability of the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) to properly manage and care for the federal prison population; and
- whether to increase or decrease federal assistance levels for state and local criminal justice systems at a time when states are facing budget shortfalls, but also at a time when the federal budget deficit continues to increase.

Science Agencies

Among the issues facing the science agencies that Congress may have opted to address in the FY2012 appropriations process are the following:

- whether the new direction for the U.S. human spaceflight program, established in October 2010 by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-267), can be implemented successfully in a period of increased budgetary constraint;
- whether to increase funding at the National Science Foundation (NSF) as proposed by the Administration; and if so, at what pace, and how will any increase be distributed among NSF accounts;
- whether to expand NSF's funding for three multi-agency R&D initiatives: the National Nanotechnology Initiative (NNI), Networking and Information Technology Research and Development (NITRD) program, and the U.S. Global Change Research Program; and
- whether to reduce funding for the Office of Science and Technology Policy as requested by the Administration, and if so, by how much.

Related Agencies

Some issues Congress might have considered while debating FY2012 funding level for related agencies include the following:

- whether to approve the Administration's request for increased appropriations for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to hire additional staff to address the expected increase in the agency's private sector charge backlog and support enforcement of systemic discrimination cases;
- whether to approve the Administration's proposal that Legal Services Corporation restrictions on class action suits be eliminated;
- whether the Legal Services Corporation could save money by encouraging private attorneys to help legal services programs by providing pro bono services; and
- whether to provide additional funding to the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, as requested by the Administration, to aid it in promoting U.S. trade initiatives and conducting negotiations.

Department of Commerce²

The Department of Commerce (Commerce Department) originated in 1903 with the establishment of the Department of Commerce and Labor.³ The separate Commerce Department was established on March 4, 1913.⁴ The department's responsibilities are numerous and quite varied; its activities center on five basic missions: (1) promoting the development of U.S. business and increasing foreign trade; (2) improving the nation's technological competitiveness; (3) encouraging economic development; (4) fostering environmental stewardship and assessment; and (5) compiling, analyzing, and disseminating statistical information on the U.S. economy and population.

The following agencies within the Commerce Department carry out these missions:

- *International Trade Administration (ITA)* seeks to develop the export potential of U.S. firms and to improve the trade performance of U.S. industry;
- *Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS)* enforces U.S. export laws consistent with national security, foreign policy, and short-supply objectives;
- *Economic Development Administration (EDA)* provides grants for economic development projects in economically distressed communities and regions;
- *Minority Business Development Agency (MBDA)* seeks to promote private- and public-sector investment in minority businesses;
- *Economic and Statistics Administration (ESA)*, excluding the Bureau of the Census, provides (1) information on the state of the economy through preparation, development, and interpretation of economic data; and (2) analytical support to department officials in meeting their policy responsibilities;
- *Bureau of the Census*, a component of ESA, collects, compiles, and publishes a broad range of economic, demographic, and social data;
- *National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA)* advises the President on domestic and international communications policy, manages the federal government's use of the radio frequency spectrum, and performs research in telecommunications sciences;
- *United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)* examines and approves applications for patents for claimed inventions and registration of trademarks;
- *National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)* assists industry in developing technology to improve product quality, modernize manufacturing processes, ensure product reliability, and facilitate rapid commercialization of products on the basis of new scientific discoveries; and
- *National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)* provides scientific, technical, and management expertise to (1) promote safe and efficient marine and air navigation; (2) assess the health of coastal and marine resources; (3) monitor and predict the coastal, ocean, and global environments (including weather forecasting); and (4) protect and manage the nation's coastal resources.

² This section was coordinated by Jennifer D. Williams, CRS Government and Finance Division.

³ 32 Stat. 825.

⁴ 15 U.S.C. 1501.

FY2011 and FY2012 Appropriations

Table 2 presents the following funding information for the Commerce Department as a whole and for each of its agencies or bureaus: the FY2011-enacted funding, the Administration's FY2012 request, the House Committee on Appropriations-recommended appropriations, the Senate-passed appropriations, and FY2012-enacted funding. The FY2012-enacted amount for the Department of Commerce is \$7.808 billion, an amount that is 4.7% below the Senate's mark, but 9.0% more than the amount the House Committee on Appropriations recommended for the department. The department's FY2012-enacted funding is 11.3% below the Administration's request, but it is 3.0% more than the FY2011-enacted amount. The Senate-passed bill included \$8.192 billion for the Department of Commerce for FY2012, an amount that was 14.4% greater than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, 8.1% more than the FY2011 appropriation, but 6.9% less than the Administration's FY2012 request. The bill reported by the House Committee on Appropriations included a total of \$7.161 billion for the Department of Commerce, an amount that was \$1.641 billion (18.6%) below the Administration's FY2012 request and \$419.6 million (5.5%) below the FY2011-enacted amount for the department. The Administration requested a total of \$8.803 billion for the Commerce Department for FY2012, a proposed 16.1% increase in funding compared to the FY2011-enacted amount of \$7.581 billion.

Table 2. Funding for the Department of Commerce
(budget authority in millions of dollars)

Bureau or Agency	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Request	House Committee Reported	Senate-Passed	FY2012 Enacted
International Trade Administration	\$440.7	\$516.7	\$450.2	\$431.7	\$455.6
Bureau of Industry and Security	100.1	111.2	100.0	98.1	101.0
Economic Development Administration	283.4	324.9	257.7	757.2 ^a	457.5
Minority Business Development Agency	30.3	32.3	30.3	29.7	30.3
Economic and Statistics Administration (excluding Census)	97.1	112.9	97.0	95.1	96.0
Census Bureau	1,149.7	1,024.8	854.5	943.3	888.3
National Telecommunications and Information Administration	41.6 ^b	55.8	40.5	45.6	45.6
Patent and Trademark Office ^c	2,090.0	2,706.3	2,706.3	2,706.3	2,706.3
Offsetting Fee Receipts (USPTO)	-2,090.0	-2,706.3	-2,706.3	-2,706.3	-2,706.3
National Institute of Standards and Technology	750.1	1,001.1	700.1	680.0	750.8
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	4,588.0	5,485.7	4,531.3	5,022.3	4,893.7
Departmental Management	99.8	137.2	99.7	88.7	88.9
Total: Department of Commerce	7,580.9	8,802.6	7,161.3	8,191.7	7,807.7

Source: FY2011-enacted amounts, FY2012-requested amounts, and House committee-reported amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-169. Senate-passed amounts were taken from H.R. 2112, as passed by the Senate. FY2012-enacted amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-284.

Note: Amounts may not add to totals due to rounding. The House committee-reported amounts include the 0.1% rescission specified in Section 543 of H.R. 2596.

- a. The Senate-passed bill includes \$500.0 million under the Economic Development Administration's Economic Development Assistance Programs account for disaster relief programs.
- b. This amount includes an unexpended \$1.0 million that was not rescinded from the National Telecommunications and Information Administration's Public Telecommunications Facilities, Planning, and Construction account under P.L. 112-10.
- c. The Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) is fully funded by user fees. The fees collected but not obligated during the current year are available for obligation in the following fiscal year and do not count toward the appropriation totals. Only newly appropriated funds count toward the annual appropriation totals. Total figures for the Department of Commerce exclude PTO.

International Trade Administration (ITA)⁵

ITA provides export promotion services, works to ensure compliance with trade agreements, administers trade remedies such as antidumping and countervailing duties, and provides analytical support for ongoing trade negotiations. ITA's mission is to improve U.S. prosperity by strengthening the competitiveness of U.S. industry, promoting trade and investment, and ensuring compliance with trade laws and agreements. ITA strives to accomplish this through the following organizational units: (1) the Manufacturing and Services Unit, which is responsible for certain industry analysis functions and promoting the competitiveness and expansion of the U.S. manufacturing sector; (2) the Market Access and Compliance Unit, which is responsible for monitoring foreign country compliance with trade agreements, identifying compliance problems and market access obstacles, and informing U.S. firms of foreign business practices and opportunities; (3) the Import Administration Unit, which is responsible for administering the trade remedy laws of the United States; (4) the Trade Promotion/U.S. Foreign Commercial Service program, which is responsible for conducting trade promotion programs, providing U.S. companies with export assistance services, and leading interagency advocacy efforts for major overseas projects; and (5) the Executive and Administrative Directorate, which is responsible for providing policy leadership, information technology support, and administration services for all of ITA.

The FY2012-enacted amount for ITA is \$455.6 million, of which \$9.4 million is to be derived from estimated fee collections, raising available funds to \$465.0 million. The enacted amount is 5.5% more than the Senate recommendation of \$431.7 million and 1.2% greater than the House recommendation of \$450.2 million. The Senate recommendation was 16.4% less than the Administration's FY2012 request of \$516.7 million and 2.0% less than the 2011-enacted level of \$440.7 million. The Administration's request anticipated the collection of \$9.4 million in fees, the same as the enacted amount and the FY2011 funding level, which would have raised available FY2012 funds to \$526.1 million. The requested increase in the FY2012 budget was part of the Obama Administration's multiyear plan to double U.S. exports over a period of five years. The Administration is requesting a total of \$78.5 million over several years for a National Export Initiative (NEI) to promote growth in the U.S. economy and create jobs by increasing the volume of U.S. exports and the number of U.S. firms that export. The Administration anticipates that the initiative will help U.S. companies be more competitive in the global market and that jobs created through export growth will be associated with higher wages.

Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS)⁶

BIS administers export controls on dual-use goods and technology through its licensing and enforcement functions. It cooperates with other nations on export control policy and provides assistance to the U.S. business community to comply with U.S. and multilateral export controls. BIS also administers U.S. anti-boycott statutes and is charged with monitoring the U.S. defense industrial base. Authorization for the activities of BIS, the Export Administration Act (50 U.S.C. *App.* 2401, *et seq.*), last expired in August 2001. On August 17, 2001, President George W. Bush invoked the authorities granted by the International Economic Emergency Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) to continue in effect the system of controls contained in the act and in the Export

⁵ This section was written by M. Angeles Villarreal, Specialist in International Trade and Finance, CRS Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

⁶ This section was written by Ian F. Fergusson, Specialist in International Trade and Finance, CRS Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

Administration Regulations (15 C.F.R., Parts 730-799), and these authorities have been renewed yearly.

The Administration's FY2012 request for BIS was \$111.2 million, an \$11.0 million (11.0%) increase from the FY2011-enacted funding level of \$100.1 million. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended \$100.0 million, 0.1% less than the FY2011-enacted level and a 10.0% decrease from the Administration's FY2012 request. The Senate recommended \$98.1 million, an 11.7% reduction from the Administration's request, and a further 1.9% reduction from the House committee's recommendation. The FY2012-enacted level for BIS is \$101.0 million, which represents a 0.9% increase from the FY2011-enacted level and a 1.0% and 2.9% increase from the House committee-recommended and Senate-passed amounts, respectively, yet it is a 9.2% decrease from the FY2012 Administration request.

The Administration's FY2012 funding request for BIS was divided among licensing activity (\$54.0 million), enforcement activity (\$51.0 million), and management and policy coordination (\$6.2 million). Of these amounts, \$14.8 million was requested for Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) enforcement. The \$11.0 million increase in the BIS request would have been primarily for additional resources to increase the number of positions in the Office of Export Enforcement (OEE) to support enhanced counter-proliferation, counterterrorism, and national security initiatives and investigations. BIS sought an additional 28 FTE positions and \$10.4 million to staff these programs. BIS sought budget authority for 394 positions for FY2012.

Economic Development Administration (EDA)⁷

EDA was created pursuant to the enactment of the Public Works and Economic Development Act (PWEDA) of 1965,⁸ with the objective of fostering growth in economically distressed areas characterized by high levels of unemployment and low per-capita income levels. Federally designated disaster areas and areas affected by military base realignment or closure (BRAC) are also eligible for EDA assistance. EDA provides grants for public works, economic adjustment in case of natural disasters or mass layoffs, technical assistance, planning, and research.

P.L. 112-55 provides \$457.5 million in EDA assistance and salaries and expenses, including \$200.0 million in supplemental disaster assistance for states and communities in presidentially declared disaster areas, and \$37.5 million for EDA salaries and expenses. The act also provides \$220.0 million for EDA assistance programs, including \$111.6 million for public works projects, \$50.0 million for economic adjustment assistance activities, and \$29.0 million for planning grants.

The act includes several set asides within the economic adjustment assistance subaccount. Specifically, the act directs EDA to allocate up to \$5.0 million for each of these activities:

- \$5.0 million in support of the repatriation of jobs of small to mid-size U.S. companies, particularly those involved in manufacturing, research, or services;
- \$5.0 million in credit subsidies in support of loan guarantees to small or medium-size manufacturers involved in the use of or production of innovative technologies; and
- \$5.0 million in grants or loan guarantee credit subsidies in support of the creation of regional innovation clusters.

⁷ This section was written by Eugene Boyd, Analyst in Federalism and Economic Development Policy, CRS Government and Finance Division.

⁸ P.L. 89-136; 42 U.S.C. 3121.

The act limits the loan guarantee commitments for innovative technologies and regional clusters to no more than \$70.0 million. The conference report accompanying the act directs EDA to commission a review of the University Centers program funded under the Technical Assistance subaccount; directs EDA to focus trade adjustment assistance on manufacturers impacted by trade; and encourages EDA to use a portion of funds allocated for regional innovation program activities in support of science parks.

The Senate recommended \$757.2 million for EDA in FY2012, including \$37.2 million for EDA salaries and expenses. The bill, as passed by the Senate, also included \$500.0 million for disaster recovery activities targeted to areas included in 2011 presidential disaster declarations. The Senate bill would have exempted a portion (\$365.0 million) of the \$500.0 million in EDA assistance targeted to disaster areas from the sequestration process outlined in the Budget Control Act of 2011. Excluding the \$500.0 million for disaster activities, the Senate recommended \$257.2 million for EDA activities and salaries and expenses. This amount was \$500,000 less than the \$257.7 million recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, \$67.8 million less than the \$324.9 million requested by the President, and \$26.3 million less than the \$283.4 million enacted for FY2011. The bill recommended \$20.0 million in support of the Administration's Regional Innovation Program, which was \$20.0 million less than requested by the Administration. The House did not include a recommended FY2012 appropriation for this program.⁹

⁹ For a detailed discussion of EDA funding and reauthorization issues in the 112th Congress, see CRS Report R41162, *Economic Development Administration: Reauthorization Issues in the 112th Congress*, by Eugene Boyd.

Table 3. EDA Programs and Salaries and Expenses: FY2012

(in millions of dollars)

	FY2012 Request	House Committee Reported	Senate- Passed	FY2012 Enacted
Public Works	\$96.0	\$123.3	\$91.0	\$111.6
Economic Adjustment Assistance	84.9	38.6	48.7	50.1 ^a
Planning Grants	27.0	31.0	31.0	29.0
Technical Assistance	18.4	9.8	12.0	12.0
Research and Evaluation	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
Global Climate Change Mitigation	16.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Regional Innovation	40.0	0.0	20.0	— ^b
Trade Adjustment Assistance	0.0	15.8	15.8	15.8
Sub-total	284.3	220.0	220.0	220.0
Salaries and Expenses	40.6	37.9	37.2	37.5
Disasters Relief Assistance	0.0	0.0	500.0 ^c	200.0
Total	324.9	257.9	757.2	457.5

Source: FY2012-requested amounts and House committee-reported amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-169. Senate-passed amounts were taken from S.Rept. 112-78. FY2012-enacted amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-284.

- a. Includes set asides for following activities: \$5.0 million for loan guarantees in support of innovative technologies used or developed by small and mid-size businesses, and \$5.0 million for loan guarantees and grants to support regional innovation program activities.
- b. Administration had requested a separate appropriation for Regional Innovation Program activities. Loan guarantees will be funded under the Economic Adjustment Assistance program.
- c. The Senate-passed version of H.R. 2112 recommended a total appropriation \$500.0 million for EDA disaster activities, which was designated as being for disaster relief pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

The House Committee on Appropriations' recommendation for EDA was 20.7% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 9.1% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. The committee recommended \$219.8 million for Economic Development Assistance Programs, which was \$25.7 million below the FY2011-enacted amount and \$64.5 million below the Administration's request. The committee recommended \$37.9 million for EDA salaries and expenses, which was the same as the FY2011 amount and \$2.7 million below the Administration's request.

The Administration's FY2012 request for EDA was a 14.6% increase from the FY2011-enacted funding level. The FY2012 request would have provided \$40.6 million for the salaries and expenses account and \$284.3 million for Economic Development Assistance Programs. These programs include the 21st Century Innovation Infrastructure program (the proposed successor to the long-standing EDA Public Works program); the Economic Adjustment Assistance program; the new Regional Innovation Program established under the America COMPETES Act (P.L. 111-358); the Partnership Planning program (the proposed successor to the EDA Planning program); Technical Assistance; the Sustainable Economic Development program (the proposed successor to the Global Climate Change program); and the Research and Evaluation program. No funding was requested for the Trade Adjustment Assistance program.

Minority Business Development Agency (MBDA)¹⁰

MBDA, established by Executive Order 11625 on October 13, 1971, is charged with the lead role in coordinating all of the federal government's minority business programs.¹¹ As part of its strategic plan, MBDA seeks to develop an industry-focused, data-driven, technical assistance approach to give minority business owners the tools essential for becoming first- or second-tier suppliers to private corporations and the federal government in the new procurement environment. Progress is measured in increased gross receipts, number of employees, and size and scale of firms associated with minority business enterprise.

P.L. 112-55 appropriated \$30.3 million for MBDA activities. This amount is the same as what was enacted for FY2011, \$2.0 million (6.1%) less than the \$32.3 million the Administration requested, \$607,000 (2.0%) more than the Senate-approved \$29.7 million, and \$30,000 (0.1%) more than the \$30.3 million recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. The Senate approved \$2.6 million (8.0%) less than requested, \$607,000 (2.0%) less than enacted for FY2011, and \$577,000 (1.9%) less than recommended by the House committee. The House committee's recommendation was \$2.0 million (6.2%) below the request and \$30,000 (0.1%) less than what was enacted for FY2011. The Administration's FY2012 request for MBDA was a 6.5% increase from the FY2011-enacted funding level.

Economic and Statistics Administration (ESA)¹²

ESA provides economic data, analysis, and forecasts to government agencies and, when appropriate, to the public. ESA includes the Bureau of the Census (discussed separately), the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), and STAT-USA.¹³ ESA has three core missions: to maintain a system of economic data, to interpret and communicate information about the forces at work in the economy, and to support the information and analytical needs of the executive branch. Funding for ESA includes two primary accounts: ESA headquarters and BEA. ESA headquarters staff provide economic research and policy analysis in support of the Secretary of Commerce and the Administration. The BEA account funds BEA activities, among which are producing estimates of national gross domestic product and related measures.

Congress approved an FY2012 funding level of \$96.0 million for ESA, \$16.9 million (15.0%) below the Administration's requested \$112.9 million, \$1.1 million (1.1%) less than the FY2011-enacted amount of \$97.1 million, \$881,000 (0.9%) more than the \$95.1 million approved by the Senate, and \$963,000 (1.0%) less than the \$97.0 million recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations.

The Senate-approved amount for ESA in FY2012 was \$17.8 million (15.8%) less than requested, \$1.9 million (2.0%) under the FY2011-enacted amount, and \$1.8 million (1.9%) less than recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. The House committee's recommendation was \$16.0 million (14.1%) below the FY2012 request and \$97,000 (0.1%) less

¹⁰ This section was written by Eugene Boyd, Analyst in Federalism and Economic Development Policy, CRS Government and Finance Division.

¹¹ 36 *Federal Register* 19967; 3 C.F.R., 1971-1975 Comp. 9. 616.

¹² This section was written by Jennifer D. Williams, Specialist in American National Government, CRS Government and Finance Division.

¹³ STAT-USA provides U.S. economic and financial data, international trade statistics, and market research reports. Since 1994, STAT-USA has been funded through user fees and thus is excluded from this discussion. The regional input-output modeling system maintained by BEA is excluded for the same reason.

than the FY2011-enacted amount. The Administration's FY2012 request for ESA exceeded the FY2011-enacted amount by \$15.9 million (16.4%).

Bureau of the Census¹⁴

The U.S. Constitution requires a population census every 10 years, to serve as the basis for apportioning seats in the House of Representatives.¹⁵ Decennial census data also are used for within-state redistricting and in certain formulas that determine the annual distribution of more than \$400 billion in federal funds to states and localities. The Bureau of the Census, established as a permanent office on March 6, 1902,¹⁶ conducts the decennial census under Title 13 of the U.S. Code, which also authorizes the Census Bureau to collect and compile a wide variety of other demographic, economic, housing, and governmental data.

To fund the Census Bureau in FY2012, Congress approved \$888.3 million, \$136.4 million (13.3%) less than the Administration's request of \$1.025 billion, \$261.4 million (22.7%) below the \$1.150 billion FY2011-enacted amount, and \$55.0 million (5.8%) less than the Senate-approved \$943.3 million, but \$33.8 million (4.0%) more than the House Committee on Appropriations' \$854.5 million recommendation. The total for the Bureau includes \$253.3 million for the salaries and expenses account, and \$635.0 million¹⁷ for the periodic censuses and programs account. The enacted amount for salaries and expenses is \$18.7 million (6.9%) less than the requested \$272.1 million, \$5.2 million (2.0%) less than the \$258.5 million enacted for FY2011, and the same as what the Senate approved for FY2012, but is \$4.9 million (1.9%) below the House committee-recommended \$258.2 million. For periodic programs, the enacted amount is \$117.7 million (15.6%) less than the request of \$752.7 million, \$256.2 million (28.7%) below the FY2011-enacted funding level of \$891.2 million, and \$55.0 million (8.0%) less than the Senate-approved \$690.0 million for FY2012, but is \$38.8 million (6.5%) more than the \$596.2 million recommended by the House committee.

The Senate's recommendation for the Bureau in FY2012 was \$88.8 million (10.4%) more than that of the House Committee on Appropriations, but \$81.4 million (7.9%) less than the Administration's request, and \$206.4 million (18.0%) below the FY2011-enacted amount. The Senate-approved FY2012 amount for salaries and expenses was \$4.9 million (1.9%) below the funding level recommended by the House committee for this account, \$18.7 million (6.9%) below the budget request, and \$5.2 million (2.0%) less than the FY2011-enacted amount. The Senate-approved amount for periodic censuses and programs in FY2012 was \$93.8 million (15.7%) more than the House committee's recommendation, but \$62.7 million (8.3%) below the request for this account, and \$201.2 million (22.6%) less than the FY2011-enacted amount.

With respect to the periodic censuses and programs account, the Senate Committee on Appropriations directed "the Bureau to consider budgeting for the 2020 decennial census at a

¹⁴ This section was written by Jennifer D. Williams, Specialist in American National Government, CRS Government and Finance Division.

¹⁵ See Article 1, Section 2, clause 3, as modified by Section 2 of the 14th Amendment.

¹⁶ 32 Stat. 51.

¹⁷ The conference report for H.R. 2112, P.L. 112-55, provides that, of the \$690.0 million for periodic censuses and programs in FY2012, to remain available until Sept. 30, 2013, \$635.0 million "is appropriated from the general fund" and \$55.0 million "is derived from available unobligated balances from the Census Working Capital Fund." U.S. Congress, Conference Committee, *Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Programs for the Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 2012, and for Other Purposes*, conference report to accompany H.R. 2112, 112th Cong., 1st sess., H.Rept. 112-284 (Washington: GPO, 2011), p. 43.

level less than the 2010 Census and ... spending less than the 2000 census, not adjusting for inflation.” The committee further noted that it “strongly” supported the Economic Census, and directed “the Bureau to preserve funding when considering reductions.”¹⁸ The 2012 economic census was jeopardized, according to the House Committee on Appropriations’ minority views,¹⁹ as well as the Census Bureau’s assessment, by the House committee’s recommended decrease for the periodics account.

The House Committee on Appropriations’ recommendation for the Bureau was \$170.3 million (16.6%) lower than the budget request and \$295.2 million (25.7%) below the FY2011-enacted amount. The salaries and expenses account was to receive \$13.8 million (5.1%) less than requested and \$259,000 (0.1%) less than enacted for FY2011. The periodic censuses and programs account was to receive \$156.5 million (20.8%) less than requested and \$295.0 million (33.1%) below the FY2011-enacted funding level.

The Administration’s FY2012 request for the Census Bureau was \$125.0 million (10.9%) lower than the FY2011-enacted amount, largely due to fewer 2010 census activities. The decennial census, funded under the periodic censuses and programs account, is the Bureau’s most expensive program. The \$138.5 million difference between the FY2012 request and FY2011-enacted funding level for this account (\$752.7 million versus \$891.2 million, a 15.5% decrease) reflected the completion of most aspects of the 2010 census.²⁰ The Bureau will continue to release 2010 census data products and to evaluate census accuracy, and it has begun planning for the 2020 census. The periodics account also funds the American Community Survey (ACS), a continuous-measurement survey that has replaced the decennial census long form.²¹ Approval of the periodics request was to enable the Bureau to proceed with its expansion of the ACS sample size from approximately 3.0 million to 3.5 million housing units a year and its other activities to improve ACS data quality.

For FY2012, the Administration’s requested a \$13.5 million (5.2%) increase in the salaries and expenses account, which included \$9.0 million to facilitate the use of administrative records in the federal statistical system. The Administration also proposed, as a cost-control measure, the termination of two programs under salaries and expenses: (1) the Statistical Abstract Program, to discontinue both the print and online versions of *Statistical Abstract*, as well as the *County and City Data Book*, *State and Metropolitan Area Data Book*, and USA Counties Web database, for savings of \$2.9 million; and (2) the Federal Financial Statistics Program, to discontinue the *Consolidated Federal Funds Report*, for \$700,000 in savings.

¹⁸ U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, *Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2012*, report to accompany S. 1572, 112th Cong., 1st sess., S.Rept. 112-78 (Washington: GPO, 2011), pp. 16-17.

¹⁹ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, *Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2012*, “Minority Views,” report to accompany H.R. 2596, 112th Cong., 1st sess., H.Rept. 112-169, (Washington: GPO, 2011), p. 139.

²⁰ For a discussion of the 2010 census, see CRS Report R40551, *The 2010 Decennial Census: Background and Issues*, by Jennifer D. Williams.

²¹ For a discussion of the ACS and the long form, see CRS Report R41532, *The American Community Survey: Development, Implementation, and Issues for Congress*, by Jennifer D. Williams.

National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA)²²

NTIA is the executive branch's principal advisory office on domestic and international telecommunications and information technology policies. Its mandate is to provide greater access for all Americans to telecommunications services, support U.S. attempts to open foreign markets, advise on international telecommunications negotiations, fund research grants for new technologies and their applications, and assist nonprofit organizations converting to digital transmission in the 21st century. NTIA manages the distribution of funds for several key grant programs. Its role in federal spectrum management includes acting as a facilitator and mediator in negotiations among the various federal agencies regarding usage, priority access, causes of interference, and other radio spectrum questions. In recent years, one of the responsibilities of the NTIA has been to oversee the transfer of some radio frequencies from the federal domain to the commercial domain. Many of these frequencies have subsequently been auctioned to the commercial sector and the proceeds paid into the U.S. Treasury.

Enacted legislation for FY2012 provides \$45.6 million to the NTIA for salaries and expenses, an increase over the previous year of 9.6% but 18.4% less than requested by the Administration. The Administration had requested \$55.8 million for Salaries and Expenses for FY2012, an increase of \$14.3 million over FY2011-enacted appropriations of \$41.6 million. The Administration's request of \$55.8 million represented a significant increase over the \$21.8 million requested for FY2011 and the \$20.0 million appropriated in FY2010 for Salaries and Expenses. The increase was largely attributable to the costs of administration and oversight of the \$4.4 billion Recovery Act program for broadband technologies and deployment mapping, as required by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5). Requests for all oversight programs administered by the NTIA totaled \$32.3 million for FY2012. In addition, the Administration requested new funding for the NTIA of \$1.7 million to support efforts to foster new wireless broadband technologies and of \$1.0 million for its Internet Innovation initiative to address Internet-based privacy principles.

For FY2012, the House Committee on Appropriations recommended \$40.5 million for Salaries and Expenses, 27.4% less than the Administration's request and 2.5% less than the funding level for FY2011. The Senate Committee on Appropriations recommended \$45.6 million, the amount enacted; this was 12.4% greater than the amount approved by the House committee.

The House committee made no provision for Public Telecommunications Facilities, Planning, and Construction (PTFPC) in FY2012. Expenditures for PTFPC were omitted from the Administration's FY2012 request. The enacted funding level for PTFPC in FY2011 was zero. FY2010 appropriations of \$40.0 million included \$20.0 million for PTFPC. The bill reported by the Senate committee required that funds appropriated in prior years to PTFPC remain available for the administration of all open grants until their expiration. This provision was included in the bill as enacted.

²² This section was written by Linda K. Moore, Specialist in Telecommunications and Spectrum Policy, CRS Resources, Science, and Industry Division.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)²³

The USPTO examines and approves applications for patents on claimed inventions and administers the registration of trademarks. It also helps other federal departments and agencies protect American intellectual property in the international marketplace. The USPTO is funded by user fees paid by customers that are designated as “offsetting collections” and subject to spending limits established by Congress.

P.L. 112-55 provides the USPTO with the budget authority to spend \$2.706 billion in fees collected during FY2012, the same figure as the original Senate-passed legislation, as well as in H.R. 2596, as reported by the House Committee on Appropriations, and the Administration’s budget request. This amount is 29.5% above the FY2011-enacted figure of \$2.090 billion.²⁴ The act mandates that “any amount received in excess of \$2,706,313,000 in fiscal year 2012 and deposited in the Patent and Trademark Fee Reserve Fund [as per P.L. 112-29] shall remain available until expended.” The Director of the USPTO is required to submit a spending plan for these excess fees to the House and the Senate Committees on Appropriations; the planned spending is to be treated as “a reprogramming,” and any excess fees shall be used solely for the activities of the USPTO.

National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)²⁵

NIST is a laboratory of the Department of Commerce with a mandate to increase the competitiveness of U.S. companies through appropriate support for industrial development of pre-competitive, generic technologies and the diffusion of government-developed technological advances to users in all segments of the American economy. NIST research also provides the measurement, calibration, and quality assurance techniques that underpin U.S. commerce, technological progress, improved product reliability, manufacturing processes, and public safety.

The final FY2012 appropriation for NIST totals \$750.8 million, essentially the same as the \$750.1 million provided in FY2011. This amount is 10.4% more than H.R. 2112 as originally passed by the Senate, 7.2% above H.R. 2596, as reported from the House Committee on Appropriations, and 25.0% below the Administration’s request. Support for research and development under the Scientific and Technical Research and Services (STRS) account increases 14.0% from the FY2011 appropriation of \$497.4 million to \$567.0 million. This figure represents a 13.4% increase from the amount in the initial Senate-passed version of H.R. 2112, is 9.7% more than that contained in H.R. 2596, but is 16.5% below the President’s proposal. Under the Industrial Technology Services (ITS) account, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) program receives \$128.4 million, the same appropriation as FY2011, 7.0% above H.R. 2112 as first passed by the Senate, identical to the support included in H.R. 2596, and 10.0% less than the budget request. No funding is provided for the Technology Innovation Program (TIP), the Baldrige National Quality Program, or a new program proposed in the President’s budget called the Advanced Manufacturing Technology Consortia (AMTech). The construction budget is \$55.4

²³ This section was written by Wendy H. Schacht, Specialist in Science and Technology Policy, CRS Resources, Science, and Industry Division.

²⁴ The House Committee on Appropriations report to accompany H.R. 2596, H.Rept. 112-169, after recommending the \$2.706 billion in budget authority for the USPTO, states that “The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has re-estimated the fee collection to be \$2,678,000,000.”

²⁵ This section was written by Wendy H. Schacht, Specialist in Science and Technology Policy, CRS Resources, Science, and Industry Division.

million, 20.7% less than in FY2011, 7.7% less than in the original Senate-passed version of H.R. 2112, the same as in H.R. 2596, and 34.5% below the budget proposal.

The original Senate-passed version of H.R. 2112 would have funded NIST at \$680.0 million, 2.9% below the amount in H.R. 2596, 32.1% below the Administration's budget request, and 9.3% below the FY2011 appropriation of \$750.1 million. The STRS account would have totaled \$500.0 million, 3.2% below the figure in H.R. 2596, 26.4% less than the budget request, and 1.4% below the \$507.0 million²⁶ appropriated in FY2011. Under the ITS account, \$120.0 million was to be provided for the MEP program. This amount was 6.5% less than that recommended in H.R. 2596 and that appropriated for FY2011, as well as 15.8% less than the Administration's budget figure. No funding was provided for TIP, the Baldrige National Quality Program, or the proposed AMTech Consortia. Construction support would have totaled \$60.0 million, 8.3% more than the amount included in the House bill, 29.1% below the President's budget number, and 14.2% below the FY2011 appropriation of \$69.9 million.

H.R. 2596, as reported from the House Committee on Appropriations, would have provided \$700.1 million for NIST, 30.1% below the President's budget request and 6.7% below the FY2011 figure. Funding for the STRS account would have totaled \$516.5 million, 23.9% below the proposed budget number, but 1.9% over the FY2011 appropriation. The \$128.3 million recommended for MEP was 0.1% less than the FY2011-enacted amount and 10.0% less than the Administration's request. No funding was provided for TIP, the Baldrige program, or AMTech. Support for construction, at \$55.3 million, would have been 34.6% below the budget proposal and reflected a 20.8% decrease from the FY2011 figure.

The Administration's FY2012 budget proposed \$1.001 billion in funding for NIST, a 33.5% increase over the FY2011 appropriation. Support for the STRS account would have increased 33.9% to \$678.9 million. Included in the ITS account, the MEP program would have received \$142.6 million, 11.1% more than the amount appropriated in FY2011, while financing for TIP would have increased to \$75.0 million, 67.4% over the FY2011 figure of \$44.8 million. Also to be budgeted under ITS (and moved from the STRS account), support for the Baldrige program would have decreased 19.8% from \$9.6 million in FY2011 to \$7.7 million. A new program, AMTech, was to be created and funded at \$12.3 million. Support for construction would have increased 21.0% to \$84.6 million.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)²⁷

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) conducts scientific research in areas such as ecosystems, climate, global climate change, weather, and oceans; supplies information on the oceans and atmosphere; and manages coastal and marine resources. NOAA was created in 1970 by Reorganization Plan No. 4. The reorganization plan was designed to unify a number of the nation's environmental activities and to provide a systematic approach for monitoring, analyzing, and protecting the environment. NOAA's current administrative structure has evolved into five line offices, which include the National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service (NESDIS); the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS); the National Ocean Service (NOS); the National Weather Service (NWS); and the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR). In addition to NOAA's five line offices, Program Support (PS), a

²⁶ Note that the \$507.0 million includes \$9.6 million for the Baldrige National Quality Program that would no longer be funded under the STRS account after FY2011.

²⁷ This section was written by Harold F. Upton, Analyst in Natural Resources Policy, CRS Resources, Science, and Industry Division.

cross-cutting budget activity, includes the NOAA Education Program, Corporate Services, Facilities, and the Office of Marine and Aviation Operations (OMAO).

NOAA's FY2012 budget request proposed a budget neutral reorganization of its administrative structure by establishing a Climate Service line office. The reorganization would have brought together existing climate related capabilities and related funding from NWS, NESDIS, and OAR. Of the \$346.2 million NOAA requested to fund the Climate Service, \$225.9 million would have been transferred from OAR. According to NOAA, the main goal of establishing a Climate Service is to strengthen and expand NOAA's contributions to climate science by creating a more efficient and effective management structure. NESDIS would have been renamed as the National Environmental Satellite Service (NESS), while NOS and NMFS would have remained unchanged. Section 1348 of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 112-10) blocked funding to implement, establish, or create a NOAA Climate Service during FY2011. For FY2012, the House Committee on Appropriations rejected the NOAA reorganization request and instead recommended funding NOAA programs in accordance with the current organizational structure. The Senate Committee on Appropriations included a Climate Service line office in its budget recommendation, but proposed a lower funding level of \$161.5 million. The committee recommended retaining much of the agency's climate research funding in OAR. The committee also expressed concerns related to maintaining a research line office (OAR) and the future of research in the agency. The conference agreement (P.L. 112-55) funded NOAA in accordance with its current organizational structure and the conference report (H.Rept. 112-284) included language stating that the conference agreement does not establish the NOAA Climate Service as proposed by the Senate.

For FY2012, P.L. 112-55 provides a total of \$4.894 billion for NOAA. This amount is 2.6% less than the Senate's recommendation, 8.0% more than the House Committee on Appropriations' recommendation, 10.8% less than the Administration's request, and 6.7% more than the FY2011-enacted amount. For FY2012, the Senate recommended \$5.022 billion for NOAA. This amount was 10.8% more than the House Committee on Appropriations' recommendation, 8.4% less than the Administration's request, and 9.5% more than the FY2011-enacted amount. For FY2012, the House Committee on Appropriations recommended \$4.531 billion for NOAA. This amount was 17.4% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 1.2% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. For FY2012, the Administration requested \$5.486 billion for NOAA, a 19.6% increase over the FY2011 funding level of \$4.588 billion.

The NOAA budget is divided into two main accounts: Procurement, Acquisition, and Construction (PAC); and Operations, Research, and Facilities (ORF).²⁸ For FY2012, P.L. 112-55 provides \$3.022 billion for the ORF account. This amount is 3.6% less than the Senate recommendation, 8.9% more than the House Committee on Appropriations' recommendation, 10.5 % less than the Administration's request, and 5.0% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. For FY2012, the Senate recommended \$3.134 billion for the ORF account. This amount was 12.9% more than the House Committee on Appropriations' recommendation, 7.2% less than the Administration's request, and 1.5% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended \$2.776 billion for the ORF account in FY2012. This amount was 17.8% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 12.8% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. The Administration's request for the ORF account in FY2012 was \$3.378 billion, 6.1% more than the FY2011-enacted funding level of \$3.183 billion.

²⁸ There are several relatively small discretionary accounts in NOAA that have been funded in FY2012, including the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (\$65.0 million) and the Fishermen's Contingency Fund (\$350,000).

For FY2012, P.L. 112-55 provides \$1.817 billion for the PAC account. This amount is 0.9% less than the Senate recommendation, 6.8% more than the House Committee on Appropriations' recommendation, 11.5% less than the Administration's request, and 36.3% more than the FY2011-enacted amount. The Senate recommended \$1.834 billion for the PAC account. This amount was 7.8% more than the House Committee on Appropriations' recommendation, 10.7% less than the Administration's FY2012 request, and 37.6% more than the FY2011-enacted amount. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended \$1.701 billion for the PAC account in FY2012. This amount was 17.1% less than the Administration's FY2012 request, but 27.6% more than the FY2011-enacted amount. The Administration's request for the PAC account in FY2012 was \$2.053 billion, 54.0% more than the FY2011-enacted funding level of \$1.333 billion.

For FY2012, P.L. 112-55 provides approximately \$924.0 million²⁹ for the Joint Polar Satellite System (JPSS), which is over half of NOAA PAC funding. This amount is 0.3% more than the Senate's recommendation, 2.6% more than the House Committee on Appropriations' recommendation, 13.6% less than the Administration's request, and 95.8% more than the FY2011-enacted amount. The Senate recommended \$920.8 million of PAC funding for JPSS. This amount was 2.3% more than the House Committee on Appropriations' recommendation, 13.9% less than the Administration's FY2012 request, and 95.1% more than the FY2011-enacted amount. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended \$900.4 million for JPSS. This was 15.8% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 90.8% above the FY2011-enacted amount. The Administration's request for JPSS was \$1.070 billion, 126.7% more than the FY2011-enacted amount of \$471.9 million. The JPSS program has been troubled by missed deadlines and higher than anticipated costs. Although program funding has been increased relative to FY2011, the Senate Committee on Appropriations expressed deep concern about the long-term drain that JPSS could have on NOAA's other commitments.

Department of Justice³⁰

Established by an act of 1870³¹ with the Attorney General at its head, DOJ provides counsel for the government in federal cases and protects citizens through law enforcement. It represents the federal government in all proceedings, civil and criminal, before the Supreme Court. In legal matters, generally, the department provides legal advice and opinions, upon request, to the President and executive branch department heads. The major functions of DOJ agencies and offices are described below.

- *United States Attorneys* prosecute criminal offenses against the United States; represent the federal government in civil actions; and initiate proceedings for the collection of fines, penalties, and forfeitures owed to the United States.
- *United States Marshals Service* provides security for the federal judiciary, protects witnesses, executes warrants and court orders, manages seized assets, detains and transports unsentenced prisoners, and apprehends fugitives.

²⁹ An undistributed reduction of \$11.0 million will be allocated against all NOAA PAC programs including JPSS. Thus the JPSS total could be subject to a reduction.

³⁰ This section was written by Nathan James, CRS Analyst in Crime Policy; Kristin M. Finklea, CRS Analyst in Domestic Security; and William J. Krouse, CRS Specialist in Domestic Security and Crime Policy, CRS Domestic Social Policy Division.

³¹ 28 U.S.C. §501

- *Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)* investigates violations of federal criminal law; helps protect the United States against terrorism and hostile intelligence efforts; provides assistance to other federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies; and shares jurisdiction with Drug Enforcement Administration over federal drug violations.
- *Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA)* investigates federal drug law violations; coordinates its efforts with state, local, and other federal law enforcement agencies; develops and maintains drug intelligence systems; regulates legitimate controlled substances activities; and conducts joint intelligence-gathering activities with foreign governments.
- *Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF)* enforces federal law related to the manufacture, importation, and distribution of alcohol, tobacco, firearms, and explosives. It was transferred from the Department of the Treasury to the DOJ by the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-296).
- *Federal Prison System (Bureau of Prisons, BOP)* provides for the custody and care of the federal prison population, the maintenance of prison-related facilities, and the boarding of sentenced federal prisoners incarcerated in state and local institutions.
- *Office on Violence Against Women (OVW)* coordinates legislative and other initiatives relating to violence against women and administers grant programs to help prevent, detect, and stop violence against women, including domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.
- *Office of Justice Programs (OJP)* manages and coordinates the activities of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Institute of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office of Victims of Crime.
- *Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS)* advances the practice of community policing by awarding grants to law enforcement agencies to hire and train community policing professionals, acquire and deploy crime-fighting technologies, and develop and test innovative policing strategies.

Most crime control has traditionally been a state and local responsibility. With the passage of the Crime Control Act of 1968 (P.L. 90-351), however, the federal role in the administration of criminal justice has increased incrementally. Since 1984, Congress has approved five major omnibus crime control bills, designating new federal crimes, penalties, and additional law enforcement assistance programs for state and local governments.³²

FY2011 and FY2012 Appropriations

The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 includes \$27.408 billion for DOJ, an amount that is 1.8% greater than what the Senate would have provided for the department, 4.1% above the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, and 0.1% above the FY2011-enacted amount. However, the FY2012 appropriation is 4.6% below the Administration's request. The Senate-passed bill included \$26.925 billion for the Department of Justice. The amount recommended by the Senate was 4.7%

³² See, for example, the Crime Control Act of 1984 (P.L. 98-473); the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 (P.L. 99-570); the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (P.L. 100-690); the Crime Control Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-647); and the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (P.L. 103-322).

above the House Committee on Appropriations' recommended funding, but it was 6.7% less than the Administration's request and 0.9% below the department's FY2011 appropriation. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended a total of \$26.323 billion for DOJ. This amount was 8.4% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 3.9% below the FY2011-enacted level. For FY2012, the Administration requested a total of \$28.724 billion for DOJ. The Administration's request was \$1.335 billion, or 4.9% more than the FY2011-enacted amount of \$27.389 billion.

Table 4. Funding for the Department of Justice

(budget authority in millions of dollars)

Accounts	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Request	House Committee Reported	Senate- Passed	FY2012 Enacted
General Administration	\$2,208.1	\$2,325.3	\$2,110.2	\$2,207.6	\$2,227.9
General Administration	312.2	316.3	216.2	269.9	262.1
Administrative Review & Appeals	296.1	328.6	295.8	290.1	301.0
Detention Trustee	1,515.6	1,595.4	1,514.1	1,563.5	1,580.6
Office of the Inspector General	84.2	85.1	84.1	84.2	84.2
U.S. Parole Commission	12.8	13.2	12.8	12.6	12.8
Legal Activities	3,177.3	3,322.7	3,136.1	3,101.3	3,187.2
General legal activities	863.4	955.4	840.9	846.1	863.4
United States Attorneys	1,930.1	1,995.1	1,928.2	1,891.5	1,960.0
Other ^a	383.8	372.1	367.0	363.7	363.8
United States Marshals Service	1,140.1	1,259.2	1,133.0	1,131.3	1,189.0
National Security Division	87.8	87.9	87.7	86.0	87.0
Interagency Law Enforcement	527.5	541.0	527.0	517.0	527.5
Federal Bureau of Investigation	7,926.3	8,076.0	8,068.0	7,860.0	8,118.0
Drug Enforcement Administration	2,015.6	2,042.1	1,983.7	1,910.1	2,035.0
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives	1,112.5	1,147.3	1,111.4	1,090.3	1,152.0
Federal Prison System	6,384.1	6,826.4	6,407.7	6,682.5	6,644.0
Office on Violence Against Women	417.7	431.8	417.2	417.7	412.5
OVW Salaries and Expenses ^b	—	—	20.0	20.6	
Office of Justice Programs	1,697.9	1,715.3	1,308.6	1,632.4	1,616.3
Justice Assistance	234.5	178.5	182.4	121.0	113.0
State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance	1,117.8	1,173.5	968.0	1,063.5	1,162.5
Juvenile Justice Programs	275.4	280.0	—	251.0	262.5
Public Safety Officers Benefits	70.1	78.3	78.3	78.3	78.3
OJP Salaries and Expenses ^c	—	—	79.9	118.6	
Community Oriented Policing Services	494.9	669.5	—	231.5	198.5
COPS Salaries and Expenses ^d	—	—	—	24.5	

Accounts	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Request	House Committee Reported	Senate- Passed	FY2012 Enacted
OVW, OJP and COPS Salaries and Expenses	186.6	271.8	—	—	
Total: Department of Justice	27,389.2	28,724.3	26,323.3	26,925.3	27,407.7

Source: FY2011-enacted amounts, FY2012-requested amounts, and House committee-reported amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-169. Senate-passed amounts were taken from H.R. 2112, as passed by the Senate. FY2012-enacted amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-284.

Note: Amounts may not add to totals due to rounding. The House committee-reported amounts include the 0.1% rescission specified in Section 543 of H.R. 2596.

- a. Other includes subaccounts for the Antitrust Division, Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund, U.S. Trustee System Fund, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Fees and Expenses of Witnesses, Community Relations Service, and the Asset Forfeiture Fund.
- b. For FY2011, the salaries and expenses of OVW were paid out of a separate appropriation for the salaries and expenses of OVW, OJP and COPS. However, in the House committee-reported bill, the committee included funding for OVW's salaries and expenses as a separate line item under the OVW account. In the Senate-passed bill, appropriations for OVW's salaries and expenses were provided in a separate OVW salaries and expenses account.
- c. For FY2011, the salaries and expenses of OJP were paid out of a separate appropriation for the salaries and expenses of OVW, OJP and COPS. However, in the House committee-reported bill, the committee included funding for OJP's salaries and expenses as a separate line item under the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance account. In the Senate-passed bill, appropriations for OJP's salaries and expenses were provided in a separate OJP salaries and expenses account.
- d. For FY2011, the salaries and expenses of COPS were paid out of a separate appropriation for the salaries and expenses of OVW, OJP and COPS. In the Senate-passed bill, appropriations for COPS' salaries and expenses were provided in a separate COPS salaries and expenses account.

General Administration

The General Administration account provides funds for salaries and expenses for the Attorney General's office, the Inspector General's office, and other programs designed to ensure that the collaborative efforts of DOJ agencies are coordinated to help represent the government and fight crime as efficiently as possible.

The FY2012-enacted appropriation provides almost \$2.228 billion for the General Administration account. This is 0.9% more than what would have been provided by the Senate-passed amount of nearly \$2.208 billion and 5.6% more than \$2.11 billion recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. The FY2012-enacted appropriation is 4.2% less than the \$2.325 billion that the Administration had requested for FY2012 but 0.9% more than the FY2011-enacted appropriation of \$2.208 billion.

The Senate recommended a total of almost \$2.208 billion for FY2012, which would have been equal to the FY2011-enacted appropriation. This recommended amount would have been 5.1% less than the Administration's FY2012 request but 4.6% more than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended a total of \$2.11 billion for FY2012. This amount would have been 9.2% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 4.4% below the FY2011-enacted level. The Administration's request included \$2.325 billion for FY2012. This amount would have been \$117.2 million (or 5.3%) more than the enacted FY2011 appropriation of almost \$2.208 billion. Described below are several General Administration subaccounts, such as the Office of the Inspector General.

General Administration

The General Administration account includes funding for Salaries and Expenses for DOJ administration, as well as for the National Drug Intelligence Center (NDIC), Justice Information Sharing Technology, and Tactical Law Enforcement Wireless Communications.

For FY2012, Congress provides \$262.1 million. This is 2.9% less than the Senate-passed amount of nearly \$269.9 million, but 21.2% more than the House Committee on Appropriations recommended amount of \$216.2 million. The FY2012-enacted appropriation is 17.1% less than the almost \$316.3 million that the Administration had requested and 16.0% less than the FY2011-enacted appropriation of nearly \$312.2 million.

The Senate would have provided a total of almost \$269.9 million for FY2012. This would have been 13.5% less than the FY2011-enacted appropriation of almost \$312.2 million. This would also have been 14.7% less than the Administration's FY2012 request, but 24.8% more than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended a total of \$216.2 million for FY2012. This amount was 31.6% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 30.7% below the FY2011-enacted level. The House Committee-reported bill did not include funding for the NDIC. For DOJ's General Administration, the FY2012 budget request included \$316.3 million, what would have been an increase of \$4.1 million (or 1.3%) over the FY2011 appropriation. As part of the FY2012 request, the Administration proposed to reduce funding for the NDIC by almost \$9.0 million (26.4%) to \$25.0 million. In its request, the Administration indicated that NDIC's functions may be duplicative of other federal, state, and local drug intelligence centers. The idea that NDIC's functions may overlap with those of other agencies has been an issue of interest to policymakers in the past several Congresses and continues to be of concern to some.³³ The FY2012-enacted appropriation includes \$20.0 million for the NDIC, 20% lower than the amount requested by the Administration.

Administrative Review and Appeals (ARA)

ARA includes the Executive Office of Immigration Review (EOIR) and the Office of the Pardon Attorney (OPA). The Attorney General is responsible for the review and adjudication of immigration cases in coordination with the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS's) efforts to secure the nation's borders. The EOIR handles these matters, and the OPA receives and reviews petitions for executive clemency.

The FY2012-enacted appropriation includes \$301.0 million for ARA. This is 3.8% more than the Senate-passed amount of nearly \$290.1 million and 1.8% more than the House Committee on Appropriations recommended amount of almost \$295.8 million. It is 8.4% less than the \$328.6 million requested by the Administration but 1.7% more than the FY2011-enacted level of almost \$296.1 million.

The Senate approved a total of almost \$290.1 million for FY2012. This amount would have been 2.0% less than the FY2011-enacted amount, 11.7% less than the Administration's FY2012 request, and 1.9% less than the House Committee on Appropriations' recommended amount. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended a total of almost \$295.8 million for FY2012. This amount would have been 10.0% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 0.1% less than the FY2011-enacted level. The Administration's request included \$328.6 million for

³³ Legislation has been introduced in the 112th Congress that would either close or significantly reduce funding for the NDIC. See, for example, H.R. 566 and H.Amdt. 23 to H.R. 1.

ARA funding for FY2012. The requested amount exceeded the FY2011 funding level by almost \$32.5 million, representing an increase of 11.0%.

Office of the Federal Detention Trustee (OFDT)

The OFDT provides overall management and oversight for federal detention services relating to federal prisoners in nonfederal institutions or otherwise in the custody of the U.S. Marshals Service. The FY2012 appropriation for the OFDT account is \$1.581 billion, which is 1.1% more than the amount recommended by the Senate, 4.4% more than the House Committee on Appropriation's recommendation, and 4.3% more than the FY2011 appropriation. However, the FY2012-enacted amount is 0.9% below the Administration's request. The Senate recommended \$1.563 billion for the OFDT, which was 3.3% more than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriation and 3.2% more than the FY2011-enacted funding, but it was 2.0% less than the Administration's request. The bill reported by the House Committee on Appropriations included \$1.514 billion for the OFDT. This amount was 5.1% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 0.1% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. The Administration requested \$1.595 billion for this account for FY2012. The FY2012 request was 5.3% more than the \$1.516 billion Congress appropriated for FY2011.

Office of the Inspector General (OIG)

The OIG is responsible for detecting and deterring waste, fraud, and abuse involving DOJ programs and personnel; promoting economy and efficiency in DOJ operations; and investigating allegations of departmental misconduct. The FY2012-enacted appropriation provides almost \$84.2 million for the OIG. This is equal to the amount that would have been provided by the Senate-passed amount and 0.1% more than \$84.1 million recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. The FY2012-enacted appropriation is 1.0% less than the nearly \$85.1 million that the Administration had requested for FY2012 and equal to the FY2011-enacted appropriation.

The Senate approved a total of nearly \$84.2 million for FY2012. This amount would have been equal to the FY2011-enacted appropriation, 1.0% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 0.1% more than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended a total of nearly \$84.1 million for FY2012. This amount would have been 1.1% less than the \$85.1 million requested by the Administration and 0.1% less than the FY2011-enacted appropriation. The Administration's FY2012 request for the OIG was 1.0% greater than the FY2011 appropriation.

U.S. Parole Commission

The U.S. Parole Commission adjudicates parole requests for prisoners who are serving felony sentences under federal and District of Columbia code violations. Congress provides \$12.8 million for the U.S. Parole Commission for FY2012, an amount that is 2.0% more than the amount that the commission would have received under the Senate-passed bill and is approximately the same as the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. The FY2012 appropriation for the commission is the same as the FY2011 appropriation, but it is 2.9% below the Administration's request. The Senate-passed amount for the U.S. Parole Commission was \$12.6 million, an amount that was 1.9% less than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, 4.8% less than the Administration's request and 2.0% less than the FY2011 appropriation. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended \$12.8 million for the commission, an amount that was 3.0% below the Administration's request

and 0.1% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. For FY2012, the Administration requested \$13.2 million for the commission, 3.0% more than the FY2011 appropriation of \$12.8 million.

Legal Activities

The Legal Activities account includes several subaccounts: general legal activities, U.S. Attorneys, and other legal activities. The FY2012-enacted appropriation provides \$3.187 billion for Legal Activities. This is 2.8% more than what would have been provided by the Senate-passed amount of \$3.101 billion and 1.6% more than the \$3.136 billion recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. The FY2012-enacted appropriation is 4.1% less than the almost \$3.323 billion that the Administration had requested for FY2012 but 0.3% more than the FY2011-enacted appropriation of \$3.177 billion.

The Senate approved \$3.101 billion for FY2012. This amount would have been 2.4% less than the FY2011-enacted amount, 6.7% less than the Administration's FY2012 request, and 1.1% less than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. For the Legal Activities account, the House Committee on Appropriations recommended a total of \$3.136 billion for FY2012. This amount would have been 5.6% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 1.3% below the FY2011-enacted level. The President's FY2012 budget request included \$3.323 billion for the Legal Activities account, \$145.4 million (or 4.6%) more than the FY2011-enacted appropriation. Some of the Legal Activities subaccounts are described below.

General Legal Activities

The General Legal Activities account funds the Solicitor General's supervision of the department's conduct in proceedings before the Supreme Court. It also funds several departmental divisions (tax, criminal, civil, environment and natural resources, legal counsel, civil rights, INTERPOL, and dispute resolution). The FY2012-enacted appropriation provides almost \$863.4 million for General Legal Activities. This is 2.0% more than what would have been provided by the Senate-passed amount of nearly \$846.1 million and 2.7% more than the \$840.9 million recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. The FY2012-enacted appropriation is 9.6% less than the almost \$955.4 million that the Administration had requested for FY2012 and equal to the FY2011-enacted appropriation.

The Senate approved \$846.1 million for this account for FY2012. The Senate-passed amount would have been 0.6% more than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, but 11.4% less than the Administration's request and 2.0% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended a total of almost \$840.9 million for FY2012. This amount would have been 12.0% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 2.6% below the FY2011-enacted level. The Administration's FY2012 request proposed almost \$955.4 million for General Legal Activities, \$92.0 million more than the enacted FY2011 appropriation of almost \$863.4 million. The requested amount would have increased FY2012 funding by 10.7% compared to the FY2011-enacted appropriation level.

Office of the U.S. Attorneys

The U.S. Attorneys enforce federal laws through prosecution of criminal cases and represent the federal government in civil actions in all of the 94 federal judicial districts. The FY2012 appropriation for the U.S. Attorneys is \$1.96 billion. The FY2012 appropriation is 3.6% more than the Senate-passed amount, 1.6% more than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, and 1.5% more than the FY2011 appropriation, but it is 1.8% below the Administration's FY2012 request. The Senate-passed bill included \$1.892 billion for

the U.S. Attorneys. The Senate recommended amount was 1.9% below the House Committee on Appropriations' mark, 5.2% below the Administration's request, and 2.0% below the FY2011 appropriation. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended \$1.928 billion for the U.S. Attorneys. The House committee-recommended amount was 3.4% below the Administration's FY2012 request and 0.1% below the FY2011-enacted amount. The Administration's FY2012 request would have provided the U.S. Attorneys with \$1.995 billion, or a \$65.0 million increase (3.4%) over the amount appropriated for FY2011 (\$1.93 billion). The requested FY2012 budget enhancement included \$2.0 million for new data analysis capabilities that could enable the U.S. Attorneys to identify and assess cost-effective crime reduction strategies. The balance of the difference between the FY2012 requested and FY2011-enacted appropriation consisted of base adjustments, as well as offsets.

Other Legal Activities

Other Legal Activities includes the Antitrust Division, the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund, the U.S. Trustee System Fund (which is responsible for maintaining the integrity of the U.S. bankruptcy system by, among other things, prosecuting criminal bankruptcy violations), the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, the Fees and Expenses of Witnesses, the Community Relations Service, and the Assets Forfeiture Fund.

The FY2012-enacted appropriation provides \$363.8 million for the Other Legal Activities account. This is nearly equal to the \$363.7 million that would have been provided by the Senate and 0.9% less than the nearly \$367.0 million recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. The FY2012-enacted appropriation is 2.2% less than the \$372.1 million that the Administration had requested for FY2012 and 5.2% less than the FY2011-enacted appropriation of almost \$383.8 million.

The Senate approved \$363.7 million for other legal activities for FY2012. This amount would have been 5.2% less than the FY2011-enacted level, 2.3% less than the Administration's FY2012 request, and 0.9% less than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended a total of almost \$367.0 million for FY2012. This amount would have been 1.4% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 4.4% below the FY2011-enacted level of almost \$383.8 million. For FY2012, the Administration's request included \$372.1 million for Other Legal Activities, \$11.6 million, or 3.0%, more than FY2011 funding.

U.S. Marshals Service (USMS)

The USMS is responsible for the protection of the federal judicial process, including protecting judges, attorneys, witnesses, and jurors. In addition, USMS provides physical security in courthouses, safeguards witnesses, transports prisoners from court proceedings, apprehends fugitives, executes warrants and court orders, and seizes forfeited property. For FY2012, Congress appropriated \$1.189 billion for the U.S. Marshals Service. This amount is 5.1% greater than the amount recommended by the Senate, 4.9% greater than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, and 4.3% greater than the FY2011 appropriation. However, the FY2012 appropriation for the USMS is 5.6% below the Administration's request. The Senate recommended \$1.131 billion for the USMS, an amount that was 0.2% below the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, 10.2% less than the Administration's request and 0.8% less than FY2011-enacted funding. The House committee-recommended amount for the USMS was \$1.133 billion. The amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations would have been 10.0% less than the FY2012 request and 0.6% below the

USMS's FY2011 appropriation. The Administration requested a total of \$1.259 billion for the USMS for FY2012. The FY2012 request was \$119.1 million, or 10.4%, more than the FY2011 appropriation of \$1.14 billion.

National Security Division (NSD)

The NSD coordinates DOJ's national security and terrorism missions through law enforcement investigations and prosecutions. The NSD was established in DOJ in response to the recommendations of the Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD Commission), and authorized by Congress on March 9, 2006, in the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005. Under the NSD, the DOJ resources of the Office of Intelligence Policy and Review and the Criminal Division's Counterterrorism and Counterespionage Sections were consolidated to coordinate all intelligence-related resources and to ensure that criminal intelligence information is shared, as appropriate.

For FY2012, Congress appropriated \$87.0 million for the NSD. This amount is \$762,000 (0.9%) less than the FY2011-enacted amount, \$882,000 (1.0%) less than the President's request, \$674,000 (0.8%) less than the House-reported amount, and \$993,000 (1.2%) less than the Senate-passed amount. By comparison, the Senate-passed bill would have provided \$86.0 million for the NSD, nearly \$1.8 million (2.0%) less than the FY2011-enacted amount, nearly \$1.9 million (2.1%) less than the President's request, and \$1.7 million (1.9%) less than the House mark. The House-reported bill would have provided \$87.7 million for the NSD, \$88,000 (0.1%) less than the FY2011-enacted amount and \$208,000 (0.2%) less than the FY2012 request. The Administration's FY2012 request of \$87.9 million for the NSD was almost the same amount as appropriated for FY2011. Notwithstanding that the request includes no net funding increase, requested FY2012 budget enhancements included

- \$274,000 for counterterrorism investigations and prosecutions,
- \$298,000 for export enforcement and counterespionage prosecution, and
- \$157,000 for strengthening international partnerships to advance U.S. national security interests.

To the extent that these requested budget enhancements have been funded under the FY2012 appropriation, they are to be offset by other savings and efficiencies, which were identified by the Administration in its budget request.

Interagency Law Enforcement

The Interagency Law Enforcement account reimburses departmental agencies for their participation in the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force (OCDETF) program. Organized into nine regional task forces, this program combines the expertise of federal agencies with the efforts of state and local law enforcement to disrupt and dismantle major narcotics-trafficking and money-laundering organizations. From DOJ, the federal agencies that participate in OCDETF are the DEA; the FBI; the ATF; the USMS; the Tax and Criminal Divisions of DOJ; and the U.S. Attorneys. From the Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the U.S. Coast Guard participate in OCDETF. In addition, from the Department of the Treasury, the Internal Revenue Service and Treasury Office of Enforcement also participate in OCDETF. Moreover, state and local law enforcement agencies participate in approximately 90% of all OCDETF investigations.

The FY2012-enacted appropriation provides \$527.5 million for the Interagency Law Enforcement account. This is 2.0% more than the nearly \$517.0 million that would have been provided by the Senate and 0.1% more than the nearly \$527.0 million recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. The FY2012-enacted appropriation is 2.5% less than the almost \$541.0 million that the Administration had requested for FY2012 and equal to the FY2011-enacted appropriation.

The Senate recommended almost \$517.0 million for FY2012. This amount would have been 2.0% less than the FY2011-enacted level, 4.4% less than the Administration's FY2012 request, and 1.9% less than the House Committee on Appropriations' recommendation for FY2012. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended a total of \$527.0 million for FY2012. This amount would have been 2.6% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 0.1% less than the FY2011-enacted level. For FY2012, the Administration proposed almost \$541.0 million for ODCETF. The proposed FY2012 funding level was almost \$13.5 million, or 2.6%, more than the FY2011-enacted funding level. The Administration requested an increase in funding for ODCETF operations relating to the Southwest border. In response to concerns that the escalating drug trafficking-related violence in Mexico could spread into the United States, the Administration proposed an increase in funding to enhance investigations (an increase of almost \$1.2 million) and prosecutions (an increase of \$8.1 million) along the Southwest border as part of the Southwest Border Violence Initiative. The majority of the funding was requested to ensure that resources would be available to provide adequate legal oversight of cases and to prosecute fully those drug trafficking and money laundering organizations. The House committee-reported amount did not include the Administration's requested increase for Southwest border activities.

Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)

The FBI is the lead federal investigative agency charged with defending the country against foreign terrorist and intelligence threats; enforcing federal laws; and providing leadership and criminal justice services to federal, state, municipal, tribal, and territorial law enforcement agencies and partners. Since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, the FBI has reorganized and reprioritized its efforts to focus on preventing terrorism and related criminal activities. From FY2001 through FY2010, Congress has more than doubled direct appropriations for the FBI from \$3.32 billion to \$7.899 billion, or a 137.9% increase.³⁴ For FY2011, Congress appropriated \$7.926 billion for the FBI (an increase of less than 0.4%).

For FY2012, Congress has appropriated 8.118 billion for the FBI. This amount is \$191.7 million (2.4%) greater than the FY2011-enacted amount, \$42.0 million (0.5%) greater than the President's request, \$50.1 million (0.6%) greater than the House-reported amount, and \$258.0 million (3.3%) greater than Senate-passed amount. By comparison, the Senate-passed bill would have provided \$7.86 billion for the FBI, \$66.3 million (0.8%) less than the FY2011 appropriation, \$216 million (2.7%) less than the request (\$8.076 billion), and \$207.9 million (2.6%) less than the House mark. The House-reported bill would have provided \$8.068 billion for the FBI, \$141.6 million (1.8%) more than the FY2011 appropriation, but \$8.1 million (0.1%) less than the request.

The FBI appropriation is provided in two accounts. One for salaries and expenses. The other for construction. For FBI salaries and expenses, Congress has appropriated \$8.037 billion for the FBI. This amount is \$217.8 million (2.8%) greater than the FY2011-enacted amount, \$42.0 million (0.5%) greater than the President's request, \$50.0 million (0.6%) greater than the House-reported amount, and \$252.0 million (3.2%) more than the Senate-passed amount. By comparison, the Senate-reported bill would have provided \$7.785 billion, \$34.2 million (0.4%)

³⁴ The FY2010-enacted amount does not reflect a \$50 million rescission or a \$24 million supplemental appropriation.

less than the FY2011 appropriation (\$7.819 billion), \$210 million (2.6%) less than the request (\$7.995 billion), and \$202 million (2.5%) less than the House mark. The House-reported bill would have provided \$7.987 billion, \$167.8 million (2.1%) greater than the FY2011 appropriation, but \$8.0 million (0.1%) less than the request.

The President's FY2012 request included an increase of \$175.8 million (2.2%) greater than the FY2011 appropriation. The FY2012 request included \$131.5 million in the following budget enhancements:

- \$48.9 million to improve national security surveillance capabilities,
- \$40 million for aircraft to support the FBI's Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Render Safe mission,
- \$18.6 million for cybersecurity/computer intrusion investigations,
- \$12.5 million for FBI participation in the Domestic Communications Assistance Center, a DOJ initiative to increase electronic surveillance capabilities nationally,
- \$9 million to address further violent crime in Indian Country, and
- \$2.5 million for increased analytical training.

Because Congress has appropriated \$8.037 billion, or \$42.0 million more than requested, for the FBI salaries and expenses account, it is likely that all of the requested budget enhancements were fully funded. Indeed, conference report language indicates that all of the above requested enhancements are fully funded, except for the last two (Indian Country and analytical training). In addition, conference report language directs the FBI to report back to the Appropriations Committees within 120 day of enactment on "agent utilization and overall staff resources" allocated for human trafficking and intellectual property investigations, as well as interagency information sharing initiatives for the purposes of identifying criminal aliens. Also, in report language, conferees encouraged the FBI to facilitate familial searches of the Combined DNA Index System of convicted offenders,³⁵ directed the FBI to increase its efforts to investigate human rights abuses that were committed by foreign nationals who are now residing in the United States, and supported an FBI policy prohibiting any formal, non-investigative cooperation with unindicted co-conspirators in terrorism cases.

Senate report language indicated that \$18.6 million and \$12.5 million in requested budget enhancements for cybersecurity and electronic surveillance capabilities, respectively, would have been fully funded under the recommendation. It also indicated that \$40.9 million, instead of the requested \$48.9 million, would have been provided to improve national security surveillance capabilities. In addition, Senate report language indicated that budget authority to use existing funding to buy aircraft for the Render Safe mission was provided for FY2011 and additional funding would not be provided under the FY2012 mark. Senate report language was silent regarding specific amounts for other requested funding enhancements, although it addressed several concerns (e.g., computer intrusions, civil rights enforcement, intellectual property rights, child exploitation, mortgage fraud, gang enforcement, border violence, and severe forms of human trafficking). Furthermore, Senate report language indicated that the Senate mark would have provided \$644.7 million for the FBI Criminal Justice Information Services Division, an amount that includes \$350.8 million in user fees.³⁶ (Conference report language indicates that the

³⁵ For further information, see CRS Report R41800, *DNA Testing in Criminal Justice: Background, Current Law, Grants, and Issues*, by Nathan James.

³⁶ In addition to the \$8.076 billion requested by the President for the FBI, the FY2012 request includes an assumption that the FBI will collect another \$1.505 billion in user fees and other reimbursable receipts. Hence, total FY2012 requested budget authority for the FBI would be \$9.581 billion.

full amount for CJIS in terms of both direct funding and user fees has been provided for FY2012.) Notwithstanding the House 0.1% rescission (\$8.0 million), the House bill would have funded all of the requested FY2012 budget enhancements.

For FBI construction, Congress has matched the President's FY2012 request and appropriated nearly \$81.0 million. This amount is \$26.1 million (24.4%) less than the FY2011-enacted amount. By comparison, the Senate bill would have provided \$75 million for FY2012, or \$32.5 million (30%) less than the FY2011 appropriation (\$107.1 million), nearly \$6.0 million (7.4%) less than the FY2012 request (\$81 million), and \$5.9 million (7.3%) less than the House mark. The House-reported bill would have provided \$80.9 million, or \$26.2 million (24.5%) less than the FY2011 appropriation and \$81,000 (0.1%) less than the President's request.

Regarding FBI appropriations and oversight, in March 2010, the DOJ OIG reported on the FBI's efforts to develop a computerized case management system for investigations known as Sentinel.³⁷ At that time, the final costs for Sentinel were expected to exceed \$451 million,³⁸ and the OIG expressed "significant concern" about system's cost and rate progress.³⁹ In February 2011, the acting OIG testified that Sentinel was at least two years behind schedule and \$100 million over budget.⁴⁰ Regarding Sentinel, the FY2012 appropriation includes a provision (§213) that statutorily requires the FBI to report to the Appropriations Committees on a "cost and schedule estimate for the final operating capability."

In addition, the OIG testified that the FBI had taken appropriate steps to respond to potential WMD incidents under the National Response Framework,⁴¹ but DOJ as a whole and its other components were not as adequately prepared.⁴² Furthermore, in April 2010, the OIG issued an audit of the FBI personnel resource allocations, including how the FBI used field agents and intelligence analysts for counterterrorism and other investigative matters.⁴³ The OIG audit found that, from FY2005 through FY2009, the FBI used greater resources than had been originally allocated for national security matters and other national priorities (counterterrorism, counterintelligence, cybercrime, and civil rights).⁴⁴ Consequently, fewer resources than had been originally allocated were used for traditional crime matters (organized crime, gangs, drug-related crime, white collar crime, and violent crime).⁴⁵ However, the underutilization of allocated resources for traditional crime trended downward over those years.⁴⁶ Nonetheless, according to

³⁷ U.S. Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General, *Status of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Implementation of the Sentinel Project*, Report 10-22, March 2010, 15 pp.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 11.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 14.

⁴⁰ Statement of Cynthia A. Schneder, Acting Inspector General, U.S. Department of Justice before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies concerning "Oversight of the Department of Justice and Department of Commerce," February 9, 2011, p. 10.

⁴¹ According to the Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the National Response Framework (NRF) [or Framework] is a guide to how the Nation conducts all-hazards response. It is built upon scalable, flexible, and adaptable coordinating structures to align key roles and responsibilities across the Nation. It describes specific authorities and best practices for managing incidents that range from the serious but purely local, to large-scale terrorist attacks or catastrophic natural disasters. For further information, see <http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nrf/nrf-core.pdf>.

⁴² Ibid., p. 3.

⁴³ U.S. Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General, *Follow-up Audit of FBI Personnel Resource Management and Casework*, Audit Report 10-24, April 2010, 104 pp.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. vii (see Exhibit II).

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

the FBI, for FY2010, under its S&E account, \$4.762 billion (62%) and 18,547 fulltime equivalent (FTE) positions (58.7%) were allocated for the counterterrorism/counterintelligence and intelligence budget decision units.⁴⁷

Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA)

The DEA is the only single-mission federal agency tasked with enforcing the nation's controlled substance laws in order to reduce the availability and abuse of illicit drugs and the diversion of licit drugs for illicit purposes. DEA's enforcement efforts include the disruption and dismantling of drug trafficking and money laundering organizations through drug interdiction and seizures of illicit revenues and assets derived from these organizations. DEA continues to face evolving challenges in limiting the supply of illicit drugs as well as reducing drug trafficking across the Southwest border with Mexico into the United States. DEA plays a key role in the Administration's Southwest Border Initiative to counter drug-related border violence, focusing on the convergent threats of illegal drugs, drug-related violence, and terrorism in the region.

The FY2012-enacted appropriation provides \$2.035 billion for the DEA. This is 6.5% more than the \$1.910 billion that would have been provided by the Senate and 2.6% more than the nearly \$1.984 billion recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. The FY2012-enacted appropriation is 0.3% less than the \$2.042 billion that the Administration had requested for FY2012 but 1.0% more than the FY2011-enacted appropriation of almost \$2.016 billion.

The Senate recommended \$1.910 billion for the DEA for FY2012. This amount would have been 5.2% less than the FY2011-enacted level, 6.5% less than the Administration's FY2012 request, and 3.7% less than the House Committee on Appropriations' recommended amount. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended a total of almost \$1.984 billion for FY2012. This amount would have been 2.9% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 1.6% below the FY2011-enacted level. For FY2012, the President's budget request included \$2.042 billion for DEA. The requested amount represented an increase of almost \$26.5 million, or 1.3% greater than the FY2011-enacted level of almost \$2.016 billion. The FY2012 budget request included the following:

- Almost \$30.9 million to support regulatory and enforcement efforts within the Diversion Control Program,
- \$10.0 million to provide construction funding to expand the El Paso Intelligence Center (EPIC) facility,
- \$1.5 million to establish a Domestic Communications Assistance Center to enhance law enforcement electronic surveillance capabilities, and
- Eliminating (\$39.1 million) the Mobile Enforcement Team program and reassigning agents to fill other vacancies within DEA.

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF)

The ATF enforces federal criminal law related to the manufacture, importation, and distribution of alcohol, tobacco, firearms, and explosives. ATF works both independently and through partnerships with industry groups; international, state, and local governments; and other federal agencies to investigate and reduce crime involving firearms and explosives, acts of arson, and

⁴⁷ U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, *FY2012 Authorization and Budget Request to Congress*, February 2011, Exhibit B – Summary of Requirements.

illegal trafficking of alcohol and tobacco products.⁴⁸ From FY2001 through FY2010, Congress has increased the direct appropriation for ATF, from \$771.0 million to \$1.121 billion, a 45.4% increase. For FY2011, Congress appropriated \$1.113 billion for ATF.

For FY2012, Congress has appropriated ATF \$1.152 billion. This amount is \$39.5 million (3.5%) greater than the FY2011-enacted amount, \$4.7 million (0.4%) greater than the FY2012 request, \$40.6 million (3.7%) greater than the House-reported amount, and \$61.7 million (5.7%) greater than Senate-passed amount. Congress also included “futurity” language in three long-standing annual appropriations riders, which make those funding restrictions permanent law. For FY2012 and every year thereafter, these riders prohibit

- DOJ from consolidating or centralizing any records maintained by federally licensed gun dealers related to the acquisition and disposition of firearms;
- ATF from electronically retrieving firearm transfer records that have been submitted to ATF, when federally licensed gun dealers go out business, by searching those out-of-business records by any individual’s name or other personal identification code; and
- the FBI from charging a fee in connection with a Brady background checks for firearms transfer and possession eligibility, and requires further that the FBI destroy all Brady background check records related to approved firearm transfer records within 24 hours.⁴⁹

Conference report language also directs ATF to report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees annually on firearm trace requests processed for Mexican authorities.

Regarding allegations that ATF mishandled Southwest border gun trafficking investigations, conference report language does not call for an independent investigator, but it does call on both DOJ and ATF to fully cooperate with congressional oversight efforts. As discussed below, a related provision prevents any expenditure of funding provided under the act to allow operable firearms to be delivered to persons connected to drug cartels. The act also includes a provision that is similar to House language that prohibits ATF from implementing additional restrictions on the importation of shotguns. However, it does not include House language that would prohibit ATF from collecting multiple rifle sales reports from federally licensed gun dealers.

For FY2012, the Senate recommended \$1.09 billion for ATF, \$22.3 million (2.0%) less than the FY2011-enacted amount, \$57 million (5.0%) less than the Administration’s request of \$1.147 billion, and \$21.1 million (1.9%) less than the House mark. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended \$1.111 billion for ATF, \$1.1 million (0.1%) less than the FY2011-enacted amount and \$35.9 million (3.1%) less than the Administration’s FY2012 request. The FY2012 request would have provided a \$34.8 million increase (3.1%) over ATF’s enacted FY2011 appropriation. This increase included a \$1.5 million budget enhancement to allow ATF to participate in the Domestic Communications Assistance Center, a DOJ initiative to increase electronic surveillance capabilities nationally. This increase was to be offset by other savings and efficiencies identified by the Administration. Both the Senate and House marks would have resulted in reductions in ATF services and activities in FY2012.

⁴⁸ For further information, see CRS Report R41206, *The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF): Budget and Operations for FY2011*, by William J. Krouse.

⁴⁹ See § 511.

In the past year, ATF's efforts to reduce illegal gun trafficking from the United States to Mexico under Project Gunrunner have generated controversy on two counts. First, the DOJ and ATF obtained approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for an information collection initiative, under which federally licensed gun dealers in Southwest border states are required to submit multiple sales reports on certain rifles, as a means of more readily identifying possible straw purchasers and gun traffickers.⁵⁰ Second, ATF is alleged to have allowed firearms to be transferred to suspected straw purchasers.⁵¹ Then, either intentionally or unintentionally, ATF allowed those suspected criminals or their associates to smuggle those firearms across the border, in an effort to build more complex investigations designed to uncover and dismantle larger gun trafficking conspiracies.⁵² In a tragic twist of fate, some of those firearms were allegedly used in the deaths of two U.S. federal agents and perhaps hundreds of these firearms have been seized by authorities in Mexico.⁵³

In November 2010, the DOJ Office of the Inspector General (OIG) released an evaluation of Project Gunrunner⁵⁴ and, among other things, recommended that ATF work with DOJ to develop a reporting requirement for multiple long gun sales⁵⁵ because Mexican Drug Trafficking Organizations have demonstrated a marked preference for military-style firearms capable of accepting high-capacity magazines.⁵⁶ The OIG also recommended that ATF focus its investigative efforts on more complex criminal conspiracies involving high-level traffickers rather than on low-level straw purchasers.

Multiple Rifle Sales Reports

On December 17, 2010, DOJ and ATF published a "60-day emergency notice of information collection" in the *Federal Register*,⁵⁷ in which they requested that OMB review and clear a proposed information collection initiative by January 5, 2011, on an emergency basis under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.⁵⁸ While OMB initially denied ATF emergency approval, it later approved the initiative on July 11, 2011. Under this initiative, ATF is poised to require federal firearms licensees (FFLs) in Southwest border states to report to ATF whenever they make multiple sales or other dispositions of more than one rifle within five consecutive business days to an unlicensed person. Such reporting would be limited to firearms that are (1) semiautomatic, (2) chambered for ammunition of greater than .22 caliber, and (3) capable of accepting a detachable magazine. In addition, while ATF originally requested a one-year "pilot" program,⁵⁹ OMB

⁵⁰ U.S. Department of Justice, "Statement of Deputy Attorney General James Cole Regarding Information Requests for Multiple Sales of Semi-Automatic Rifles with Detachable Magazines," press release, July 11, 2011.

⁵¹ A "straw purchase" occurs when a person who is otherwise eligible to purchase a firearm purchases a firearm from a federally licensed dealer for another person, who is either prohibited from possessing a firearm or does not want a paper trail linking him to the purchased firearm.

⁵² "Is Obama A Gunrunner?," *Investor's Business Daily*, May 9, 2011, p. A16.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ U.S. Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General, *Review of ATF's Project Gunrunner*, I-2011-001, November 2010, <http://www.justice.gov/oig/reports/ATF/e11101.pdf>.

⁵⁵ Ibid, p. 40.

⁵⁶ Ibid, p. 38.

⁵⁷ Department of Justice, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, "60-Day Emergency Notice of Information Collection Under Review: Report of Multiple Sale or Other Disposition of Certain Rifles," 75 *Federal Register* 79021, December 17, 2010.

⁵⁸ For further information, see CRS Report R40636, *Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA): OMB and Agency Responsibilities and Burden Estimates*, by Curtis W. Copeland and Vanessa K. Burrows.

⁵⁹ Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, "Acting Director Announces Demand Letters for Multiple

approved the initiative for a three-year period (through July 31, 2014).⁶⁰ However, some Members of Congress oppose the multiple rifle sales reporting requirement.⁶¹ They maintain that if Congress authorized multiple handgun sales reporting in statute in 1986, then it is incumbent upon ATF to request that Congress provide it with similar statutory authority for a multiple rifle sales reporting requirement.⁶² During House markup of H.R. 2596, the House Committee on Appropriations adopted an amendment that would have prohibited ATF from implementing its multiple rifle sales reporting requirement.⁶³ However, the conference agreement did not include this House language.

Operation Fast and Furious

In February 2011, ATF and Project Gunrunner came under renewed scrutiny for a Phoenix, AZ-based investigation known as Operation Fast and Furious.⁶⁴ ATF whistleblowers have alleged that suspected straw purchasers were allowed to amass relatively large quantities of firearms as part of long-term gun trafficking investigations.⁶⁵ As a consequence, some of these firearms are alleged to have “walked,” meaning that they were trafficked to gunrunners and other criminals before ATF moved to arrest the suspects and seize all of their contraband firearms.⁶⁶ Some of these firearms were possibly smuggled into Mexico.⁶⁷ Two of these firearms—AK-47 style rifles—were reportedly found at the scene of a shootout near the U.S.-Mexico border where U.S. Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry was shot to death.⁶⁸ Press accounts assert that ATF has acknowledged that as many as 195 firearms that were purchased by persons under ATF investigation as part of Operation Fast and Furious were recovered in Mexico.⁶⁹ Questions, moreover, have been raised about whether a firearm—an AK-47 style handgun—that was reportedly used to murder U.S. ICE Special Agent Jamie Zapata and wound Special Agent Victor Avila in Mexico on February 15, 2011, was initially trafficked by a subject of a Houston, TX-based ATF Project Gunrunner investigation.⁷⁰

On June 14, 2011, Representative Darrell E. Issa and Senator Charles E. Grassley issued a joint staff report on Operation Fast and Furious,⁷¹ which chronicled that ATF line supervisors became

Sales of Specific Long Guns in Four Border States,” news release, December 20, 2010.

⁶⁰ Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Reviews Completed in the Last 30 Days, DOJ-ATF, Report of Multiple Sale or Other Disposition of Certain Semi-Automatic Rifles, OMB Control Number: 1140-0100, available at <http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain.jsessionid=9f8e89cb30d6399089b4c8ac4da993b6c0e60ddbfeff2.e34ObxiKbN0Sci0SbhaSa3aLchr0n6jAmljGr5XDqQLvpAe>.

⁶¹ Congressional Documents and Publications, “Rehberg Leads Bipartisan Letter to ATF Questioning New Firearm Dealer Regulations,” Representative Denny Rehberg news release, December 23, 2010.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Section 542 of H.R. 2596.

⁶⁴ James V. Grimaldi and Sari Horwitz, “ATF Probe Strategy Is Questioned,” *Washington Post*, February 2, 2011, p. A04.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ John Solomon, David Heath, and Gordon Witkin, “ATF Let Hundreds of U.S. Weapons Fall Into Hands of Suspected Mexican Gunrunners: Whistleblower Says Agents Strongly Objected to Risky Strategy,” Center for Public Integrity.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Kim Murphy and Ken Ellingwood, “Mexico Demands Answers on Guns,” *Chicago Tribune*, March 11, 2011, p. 13.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ U.S. Congress, Joint Staff Report, *Department of Justice’s Operation Fast and Furious: Accounts of ATF Agents*, prepared for Representative Darrell E. Issa, Chairman, United States House of Representatives, Committee on

increasingly concerned when they witnessed hundreds of firearms being illegally transferred during surveillance operations, but they were reportedly directed not to arrest the suspects and interdict those firearms. Those agents contend that this was a questionable departure from past investigative practices. On June 15, 2011, the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform held a hearing on these matters. Representative Issa, chairman of the committee, expressed his concern that DOJ had not been entirely cooperative with his committee's efforts to investigate how some of those firearms found their way to crime scenes in Mexico and on the Southwest border. Following the hearing, on June 29, 2011, Representative Elijah E. Cummings, the committee's ranking minority Member, issued a report and held a forum during which the minority explored issues raised by some of those same ATF line supervisors, who had suggested during the House hearing that the penalties for firearm straw purchases under current law are arguably not stringent enough. The minority also discussed other gun control proposals related to gun shows, semiautomatic assault weapons, .50-caliber sniper rifles, and additional penalties for gun trafficking offenses.⁷²

On July 26, 2011, the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform held a follow-up hearing on Operation Fast and Furious. As preceded the earlier hearing, a joint staff report was issued.⁷³ This report found that ATF and DOJ leadership had not informed its own Attaché serving in Mexico City, the U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, nor the Mexican authorities about the investigation.⁷⁴ As recovered firearms in Mexico increased, the ATF Attaché in Mexico City became more alarmed and contacted his superiors at ATF headquarters to express his grave concerns about the implications that this increased flow of illegal firearms could have for both Mexican and U.S. law enforcement officers as well as the public on both sides of the border. He and others were told by both ATF and DOJ officials that the investigation was under control and was having positive results.⁷⁵ As noted above, however, Border Patrol Agent Terry was killed in a firefight in December 2010, and firearms connected to Operation Fast and Furious were found at the site of that firefight.

According to the *Washington Post*, the investigation ultimately involved 2,020 firearms, of which 227 have been recovered in Mexico and 363 have been recovered in the United States.⁷⁶ So far, Operation Fast and Furious has resulted in indictments of 20 individuals on multiple counts of

Oversight and Government Reform, and Senator Charles E. Grassley, Ranking Member, United States Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, 112th Cong., 1st sess., June 14, 2011, http://oversight.house.gov/images/stories/Reports/ATF_Report.pdf.

⁷² U.S. Congress, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Minority Staff Report, *Outgunned: Law Enforcement Agents Warn Congress They Lack Adequate Tools to Counter Illegal Firearms Trafficking*, 112th Cong., 1st sess., June 30, 2011, available at <http://democrats.oversight.house.gov/images/stories/OUTGUNNED%20Firearms%20Trafficking%20Report%20-%20Final.pdf>. On July 15, 2011, Representative Carolyn B. Maloney introduced the Stop Gun Trafficking and Strengthen Law Enforcement Act of 2011 (H.R. 2554). Original cosponsors included Representative Cummings and Representative Carolyn McCarthy.

⁷³ U.S. Congress, Joint Staff Report, *Department of Justice's Operation Fast and Furious: Fueling Cartel Violence*, prepared for Representative Darrell E. Issa, Chairman, United States House of Representatives, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and Senator Charles E. Grassley, Ranking Member, United States Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, 112th Cong., 1st sess., July 26, 2011.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ Sari Horwitz, "A Gunrunning Sting Gone Fatally Wrong: Operation Meant to Seize Firearms Bound for Cartels Allows Weapons into the Streets," *Washington Post*, July 26, 2011, p. A1.

straw purchasing and other federal offenses.⁷⁷ ATF officials maintain that the investigation has yet to be concluded and additional arrests of “high-level traffickers” may be forthcoming.⁷⁸

As Senator Grassley originally called for, the House Committee on Appropriations included report language that recommends the appointment of “an outside, independent investigator,” who would be charged with conducting “a thorough investigation of the allegations against ATF with respect to Operation Fast and Furious and policies guiding this and similar operations.”⁷⁹ In addition, the committee called on both DOJ and ATF to cooperate fully with related oversight investigations, whether they be conducted by congressional committees, the DOJ OIG, or an independent investigator.⁸⁰

In report language, the Senate Committee stated that the OIG would fulfill its oversight duties, and that Operation Fast and Furious was but a small part of ATF’s Southwest border operations, which should not detract from the agency’s efforts to protect Americans from illegal gun trafficking and other forms of cross-border crime.⁸¹ Nevertheless, Operation Fast and Furious has led to the reassignment of Acting ATF Director Kenneth Melson to another part of DOJ.⁸² Conference report language (H.Rept. 112-284) included language that is similar to the Senate language, so an independent investigator was not called for. However, conference report language followed House report language and called on DOJ and ATF to fully cooperate with congressional oversight efforts.

During Senate consideration of H.R. 2112, the Senate adopted an amendment (S.Amdt. 775) that was included in the act that prohibits the expenditure on any funding provided under that act (see §219) by a federal law enforcement officer to facilitate the transfer of an operable firearm to a person known or suspected to be connected to a drug cartel without that firearm being continuously monitored or controlled.

Importability of Certain Shotguns

In addition, in January 2011, ATF released a report on the importability of certain shotguns that include features (e.g., pistol grips, folding or collapsible stocks, laser sights, and the ability to accept large capacity ammunition feeding devices) that ATF has determined to be non-sporting.⁸³ In the past, ATF issued similar reports on semiautomatic firearms that were considered to be “assault weapons,” which foreshadowed and justified further restrictions on the importation of such firearms. Some observers anticipated that ATF was poised to implement similar restrictions on the importation of shotguns. To prevent this from happening, the House Committee on Appropriations adopted an amendment during the committee’s markup that would prevent ATF from implementing new restrictions on the importation of shotguns.⁸⁴ Reflecting House language, the enacted FY2012 CJS appropriations act includes a provision (§541) that is similar to House

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ H.Rept. 112-169, p. 57.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ S.Rept. 112-78, p. 59.

⁸² David Harrison, “ATF Head is Reassigned; Issa Says Probe Will Continue,” *CQ Today*, August 30, 2011.

⁸³ U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, Firearms and Explosives Industry Division, *ATF Study on the Importability of Certain Shotguns*, January 2011, available at <http://www.atf.gov/firearms/industry/january-2011-importability-of-certain-shotguns.pdf>.

⁸⁴ Section 539 of H.R. 2596.

language that prohibits ATF from implementing additional restrictions on the importation of certain shotguns.

Other Possible Oversight Issues

Finally, the DOJ OIG reported on two other oversight issues that could have arisen during congressional consideration of the ATF FY2012 request. Those issues included ATF's shared jurisdiction with the FBI for explosives investigations,⁸⁵ and its efforts to fulfill its Emergency Support Function (ESF) #13 obligations under the National Response Framework.⁸⁶ With regard to explosives, the OIG found that DOJ's ability to respond effectively to crimes involving explosives had been hindered, because the ATF and FBI had developed parallel capabilities, but had not adequately coordinated investigations.⁸⁷ With regard to ESF #13, the OIG found that ATF had drafted a concept of operations plan, but it was incomplete as of March 2010.⁸⁸ As a consequence, national and regional coordinators had not been appointed, operational training had not been provided, available resources had not been catalogued (including law enforcement officers who would be available for deputization), and preparedness had not been tested as part of any national level exercises.⁸⁹

Federal Prison System (Bureau of Prisons)

The Bureau of Prisons (BOP) was established in 1930 to house federal inmates, to professionalize the prison service, and to ensure consistent and centralized administration of the federal prison system.⁹⁰ The mission of BOP is to protect society by confining offenders in prisons and community-based facilities that are safe, humane, cost-efficient, and appropriately secure, and that provide work and other self-improvement opportunities for inmates so that they can become productive citizens after they are released.⁹¹ BOP currently operates 117 correctional facilities across the country.⁹² BOP also contracts with Residential Re-entry Centers (RRC) (i.e., halfway houses) to provide assistance to inmates nearing release.⁹³ RRCs provide inmates with a structured and supervised environment along with employment counseling, job placement services, financial management assistance, and other programs and services.⁹⁴

⁸⁵ U.S. Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General, *Explosives Investigation Coordination Between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives*, Audit Report 10-01, October 2009.

⁸⁶ U.S. Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General, *Review of the Department's Preparation to Respond to a WMD Incident*, May 2010, Evaluations and Inspections Report I-2010-004, May 2010.

⁸⁷ For OIG finding, see *Explosives Investigation Coordination Between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives*, October 2009, Audit Report 10-01, p. 12.

⁸⁸ Among other things, the ATF anticipates leveraging federal, state, and local law enforcement assets to (1) secure an incident site and critical facilities; (2) credential authorized emergency responders and provide for their safety; and (3) control incoming and outgoing traffic. For OIG finding, see *Ibid.* and *Review of the Department's Preparation to Respond to a WMD Incident*, Evaluations and Inspections Report I-2010-004, May, 2010, p. 32.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁰ U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons, *About the Bureau of Prisons*, <http://www.bop.gov/about/index.jsp>.

⁹¹ U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons, *Mission and Vision of the Bureau of Prisons*, <http://www.bop.gov/about/mission.jsp>.

⁹² U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons, *About the Bureau of Prisons*, <http://www.bop.gov/about/index.jsp>.

⁹³ U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons, *Community Corrections*, <http://www.bop.gov/locations/cc/index.jsp>.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

Congress funds BOP's operations through two accounts under the Federal Prison System heading: Salaries and Expenses (S&E) and Buildings and Facilities (B&F). The S&E account (i.e., the operating budget) provides for the custody and care of federal inmates and for the daily maintenance and operations of correctional facilities, regional offices, and BOP's central office in Washington, DC. It also provides funding for the incarceration of federal inmates in state, local, and private facilities. The B&F account (i.e., the capital budget) provides funding for the construction of new facilities and the modernization, repair, and expansion of existing facilities. In addition to appropriations for the S&E and B&F accounts, Congress usually places a cap on the amount of revenue generated by the Federal Prison Industries (FPI)⁹⁵ that can be used for administrative expenses in the annual CJS appropriations bill. Although Congress does not appropriate funding for the administrative expenses of FPI, the administrative expenses cap is scored as enacted budget authority.

For FY2012, Congress provides a total of \$6.644 billion for BOP, which includes \$6.551 billion for S&E and \$90.0 million for B&F. The FY2012 appropriation for BOP is 0.6% less than the amount recommended by the Senate, but it is 3.7% above the House committee-recommended amount. In addition, the amount is 2.7% below the Administration's request, but it is 4.1% above the FY2011 appropriation. The Senate-passed bill included \$6.682 billion for BOP, which included \$6.59 billion for the S&E account and \$90.0 million for the B&F account. The amount recommended by the Senate was 4.3% more than the amount included in the House committee-reported bill and 4.7% more than the bureau's FY2011 appropriation, but it was 2.1% less than the Administration's FY2012 request. The House committee-reported bill included \$6.408 billion for BOP, which included \$6.306 billion for the S&E account and \$98.9 million for the B&F account. The committee's recommendation for BOP was 6.1% below the Administration's FY2012 request, but 0.4% greater than BOP's FY2011 appropriation. For FY2012, the Administration requested a total of \$6.826 billion for BOP, which included \$6.724 billion for the S&E account and \$99.4 million for the B&F account. The FY2012 request was \$442.3 million above the FY2011-enacted amount of \$6.384 billion, or 6.9% more than FY2011-enacted funding.

The growing federal prison population and prison crowding continue to be a major concern for BOP. The number of inmates held in BOP facilities grew from 125,560 in FY2000 to 177,934 in FY2011.⁹⁶ During that same time period, prison crowding grew from 32% over rated capacity to 39% over rated capacity, even though the number of facilities operated by BOP increased from 97 to 117.⁹⁷ BOP estimates that by FY2018 the federal prison system will be operating at 41% over rated capacity.⁹⁸ The growing federal prison population has not only resulted in more crowded prisons, but it has also strained BOP's ability to properly manage and care for federal inmates. BOP reports that the staff-to-inmate ratio has increased from 3.57 to 1 in FY1997 to 4.82 to 1 in FY2010.⁹⁹ As a point of comparison, BOP reports that in FY2007, the five states with the largest prison populations had a staff-to-inmate ratio of 3.33 to 1.¹⁰⁰ The growing federal prison population has also required BOP to dedicate more resources to caring (e.g., providing health care, food, and clothing) and providing programming (e.g., substance abuse treatment,

⁹⁵ For more information on FPI, see CRS Report RL32380, *Federal Prison Industries*, by Nathan James.

⁹⁶ Data provided to CRS from the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons, *FY2012 Performance Budget, Congressional Submission, Salaries and Expenses*, p. 2, <http://www.justice.gov/jmd/2012justification/pdf/fy12-bop-se-justification.pdf>.

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 9.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

educational programming, and work/vocational opportunities) for inmates. In addition, the Second Chance Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-199) required BOP to develop comprehensive reentry planning for federal inmates.

In order to meet the demands placed on it by a growing inmate population and legislative requirements, the Administration requested \$256.0 million in program changes. The additional funding would be used to cover costs associated with more inmates in the federal system (\$32.4 million), activate three new facilities (\$140.4 million),¹⁰¹ increase staffing levels in existing federal prisons (\$109.8 million), and expand residential substance abuse treatment and vocational education (\$22.2 million). The House committee-reported bill did not contain funding for most of these activities. As noted above, the House Committee on Appropriations proposed to increase BOP's FY2012 appropriation by \$30.0 million, which was less than the amount the Administration requested to cover the costs associated with the growing federal prison population. The committee directed BOP to prioritize the activation of two completed federal prisons within the amounts that would have been provided by the committee.¹⁰² As noted above, the Senate would have increased BOP's S&E account by nearly \$308 million compared to FY2011 funding. The Senate Committee on Appropriations noted in its report that it was providing BOP with enough funding to fill 274 vacant correctional worker position, so that BOP can safely manage the federal prison population and hire enough correctional staff to meet the 90% on-board level of staffing recognized by BOP as the minimal level of staffing required to properly administer the federal prison system.¹⁰³ The committee also included funding for BOP to activate prisons that have been built but have not been opened due to current budgetary constraints.¹⁰⁴ The FY2012 appropriation for BOP includes a \$268.9 million increase for BOP's S&E account, an amount approximately equal to the Administration's requested program changes. Congress provides funding so that the bureau activate prison that have been built but which are not currently taking inmates because they are not properly staffed.

Office on Violence Against Women (OVW)

The OVW was created to administer programs created under the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 1994 and subsequent legislation. These programs provide financial and technical assistance to communities around the country to facilitate the creation of programs, policies, and practices designed to improve criminal justice responses related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. The FY2012-enacted appropriation for OVW is \$412.5 million, an amount that is 1.2% below the Senate recommendation, 1.1% less than the House committee-recommendation, 4.5% less than the Administration's request, and 1.2% below the FY2011 appropriation. The Senate-passed bill included a total of \$438.2 million for OVW, which included \$417.7 for OVW grant programs, and \$20.6 million in a separate account for OVW's salaries and expenses. The total amount recommended by the committee was 0.2% less than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, 1.5% more than the Administration's request and 4.9% more than the FY2011 appropriation. The House Committee

¹⁰¹ The requested funding for activating three new prisons assumes that BOP purchased a high-security facility in Thomson, IL. Congress did not provide funding for the purchase of this facility.

¹⁰² U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, *Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2012*, Report to accompany H.R. 2596, 112th Cong., 1st sess., July 20, 2011, H.Rept. 112-169 (Washington: GPO, 2011), p. 57.

¹⁰³ U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, *Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2012*, Report to accompany S. 1572, 112th Cong., 1st sess., September 15, 2011, S.Rept. 112-78 (Washington: GPO, 2011), p. 61.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

on Appropriations recommended \$437.2 million for OVW for FY2012, but this included \$20.0 million for OVW's salaries and expenses, which were funded out of a separate appropriation for FY2011 (see **Table 4**). The committee-recommended amount was 1.3% above the FY2012 request and 4.7% more than the FY2011-enacted appropriation. The Administration requested \$431.8 million for OVW for FY2012, which was 3.4% more than the FY2011-enacted appropriation of \$417.7 million.

As a part of the FY2012 request for OVW, the Administration proposed to consolidate four existing grant programs—Services to Advocate for and Respond to Youth (\$3.5 million), Services for Children Exposed to Violence (\$3.0 million), Engaging Men and Youth in Prevention (\$3.0 million), and Supporting Teens Through Education and Protection (\$2.5 million)—into one competitive grant program. According to the Administration, the program would allow OVW to “leverage resources for maximum impact in communities by funding comprehensive projects that include both youth service and prevention components.”¹⁰⁵ The Administration requested \$14.0 million for this proposed competitive grant program. The House Committee on Appropriations did not follow the Administration's proposal. Rather, the committee recommended appropriating funding for each program the Administration sought to consolidate. The Senate recommended \$10.0 million for the Administration's proposed program. Congress ultimately accepted the Administration's proposal to consolidate the four programs into one competitive grant program. The FY2012 appropriation for OVW includes \$10.0 million for the President's consolidated youth oriented program.

Table 5. Funding for OVW Programs
(budget authority in millions of dollars)

Program	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Request	House Committee Reported	Senate- Passed	FY2012 Enacted
STOP Grants	\$209.6	\$182.0	\$209.8	\$194.0	\$189.0
National Institute of Justice (R&D)	3.0	—	3.0	—	—
Transitional Housing Assistance	18.0	—	17.9	—	—
Children Exposed to Violence Initiative	—	—	—	10.0	—
National Institute of Justice (R&D)	—	3.0	—	3.0	3.0
Transitional Housing Assistance	—	25.0	—	25.0	25.0
Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies	59.9	47.5	54.9	45.9	50.0
Homicide Reduction Initiative	—	—	—	5.0	4.0
Rural Domestic Violence Assistance Grants	40.9	38.0	41.0	34.0	34.0
Violence on College Campuses	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.0	9.0
Civil Legal Assistance	40.9	50.0	41.0	45.0	41.0
Sexual Assault Victims Services	15.0	35.0	20.0	25.0	23.0
Elder Abuse Grant Program	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.3
Safe Havens Project	14.0	11.3	11.7	11.3	11.5

¹⁰⁵ U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women, *FY2012 Performance Budget, Congressional Submission*, p. 9, <http://www.justice.gov/jmd/2012justification/pdf/fy12-ovw-justification.pdf>.

Program	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Request	House Committee Reported	Senate- Passed	FY2012 Enacted
Education and Training for Disabled Female Victims	6.7	5.8	5.8	5.0	5.8
Court Training and Improvement	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.5
Family Court Initiative	—	—	—	1.0	—
Research on Violence Against Indian Women ^a	—	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Consolidated Youth Oriented Program	—	14.0	—	10.0	10.0
Services for Children/Youth Exposed to Violence	3.0	—	3.0	—	—
Advocates for Youth/ Services for Youth Victims	3.5	—	3.5	—	—
National Tribal Sex Offender Registry	1.0	—	—	—	—
Engaging Men and Youth in Prevention	3.0	—	3.0	—	—
National Resource Center on Workplace Responses	1.0	—	1.0	1.0	1.0
Supporting Teens Through Education and Protection	2.5	—	2.5	—	—
Indian Country Sexual Assault Clearinghouse	—	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.5
OVW Salaries and Expenses ^b	—	—	20.0	—	—
Total: OVW	417.7	431.8	437.2	417.7	412.5

Source: FY2011-enacted amounts are based on a CRS analysis of the text of P.L. 112-10. FY2012-requested amounts were taken from the Office on Violence Against Women's FY2012 Congressional budget submission. House committee-reported amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-169. Senate-passed amounts were taken from H.R. 2112, as passed by the Senate. FY2012-enacted amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-284.

Note: Amounts may not add to totals due to rounding. The House committee-reported amounts include the 0.1% rescission specified in Section 543 of H.R. 2596.

a. See **Table 7**.

b. The Senate-passed bill includes \$20.6 million for OVW's salaries and expenses in a separate OVW Salaries and Expenses account.

Office of Justice Programs (OJP)

The OJP manages and coordinates the National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Victims of Crimes, Bureau of Justice Assistance, and related grant programs. OJP will receive a total of \$1.616 billion for FY2011. This amount is 1.0% below the Senate's mark, but it is 23.5% greater than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. The FY2012 appropriation for OJP is 5.5% below the Administration's request and 4.8% less than the FY2011 appropriation. The Senate recommended a total of \$1.632 billion for OJP, an amount that is 24.7% greater than the amount recommended by the House Appropriations Committee, but 4.6% less than the Administration's request and 3.9% less than the FY2011 appropriation. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended \$1.309 billion for OJP for FY2012, an amount that is 23.5% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 22.9% less than the FY2011 appropriation for OJP. The committee also proposed to consolidate funding for juvenile justice and COPS programs

under the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance account. The FY2012 requested appropriation for OJP was \$1.715 billion. The request was \$17.4 million, or 1.0%, more than what was appropriated for FY2011.

One issue Congress considered as it debated FY2012 funding for OJP was whether to reduce funding for some or all grant programs. Recently, Congress has sought to reduce non-security discretionary spending as a means of reigning-in federal deficits and accounts that fund DOJ grant programs have been targeted for potential cuts. Proposals to reduce or eliminate funding for DOJ grant programs has stirred some measure of controversy. In general, opponents of cuts assert that these grant programs provide assistance to state and local governments to fight crime and provide for the safety of the American populace and this aid is needed more now than ever given that many states are facing budget shortfalls. Proponents for cuts to DOJ grant programs argue that states are responsible for the administration of their criminal justice systems and it is not the federal government's role to support state efforts to investigate crimes and prosecute and sanction offenders, especially at a time when the federal government is borrowing to finance the annual budget. As noted above, Congress reduced OJP's funding by 5.5% compared to the FY2011 appropriation, and as outlined below, few programs received increased funding in FY2012. Congress chose to eliminate funding for some programs for FY2012 (e.g., the Statewide Automated Victim Notification System and the Safe Start programs) and it also consolidated funding for the Northern and Southwest Border Prosecution Initiatives into a Border Prosecution Initiative.

Justice Assistance

The Justice Assistance account, among other things, funds the operations of the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the National Institute of Justice, along with providing assistance to missing and exploited children programs. The FY2012 appropriation for the Justice Assistance account is \$113.0 million, an amount that is 6.6% below the Senate recommendation, 38.0% below the House committee-recommendation, 36.7% less than the Administration's request, and 51.8% below the FY2011 appropriation. For FY2012, Congress moved funding for the Missing and Exploited Children programs from the Justice Assistance account to the Juvenile Justice Programs account, which partially explains the large reduction in funding for this account compared to the FY2011 appropriation. The Senate-passed bill included \$121.0 million for the Justice Assistance account, which was 33.7% less than the House committee-reported amount, 32.2% less than the Administration's request and 48.4% less than the FY2011 appropriation. The House committee-reported bill included \$182.4 million for the Justice Assistance account. The committee's proposal was 2.2% greater than the Administration's request, but 22.2% below the FY2011-enacted amount. For FY2012, the Administration requested \$178.5 million for the Justice Assistance account, which was 23.9% less than the FY2011 appropriation of \$234.5 million.

Table 6. Funding for Justice Assistance Programs
(budget authority in millions of dollars)

Program	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Request	House Committee Reported	Senate-Passed	FY2012 Enacted
Bureau of Justice Statistics	\$59.9	\$57.5	\$46.6	\$45.0	\$45.0
National Institute of Justice	47.9	55.0	41.0	40.0	40.0
Statewide Automated Victim Notification System	12.0	—	—	—	—
Regional Information Sharing System ^a	44.9	—	25.0	35.0	27.0
Missing and Exploited Children ^b	69.9	60.0	69.9	—	—
State and Local Help Desk and Diagnostic Center Program	—	6.0	—	—	—
Evaluation Clearinghouse	—	—	—	1.0	1.0
Total: Justice Assistance	234.5	178.5	182.4	121.0	113.0

Source: FY2011-enacted amounts are based on a CRS analysis of the text of P.L. 112-10. FY2012-requested amounts were taken from the Office of Justice Program's FY2012 Congressional budget submission. House committee-reported amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-169. Senate-passed amounts were taken from H.R. 2112, as passed by the Senate. FY2012-enacted amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-284.

Note: Amounts may not add to totals due to rounding. The House committee-reported amounts include the 0.1% rescission specified in Section 543 of H.R. 2596.

a. See **Table 7**.

b. See **Table 8**.

State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance

The State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance account includes funding for a variety of grant programs to improve the functioning of state, local, and tribal criminal justice systems. Some examples of programs that have traditionally been funded under this account include the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) program, the Drug Courts program, and the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP). Congress provides \$1.163 billion for the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance account for FY2012. This amount is 9.3% more than the Senate's mark, 20.1% more than the House committee recommendation, and 4.0% more than the FY2011 appropriation. However, the FY2012 appropriation is 0.9% less than the Administration's request. As a part of the FY2012 appropriation, Congress moved funding for DNA backlog reduction programs and the Bulletproof Vests Grant program from the Community Oriented Policing Services account to the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance account.

The Senate-passed bill included \$1.063 billion for the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance account, an amount that was 9.9% more than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, but 9.4% less than the Administration's request and 4.9% less than the FY2011-enacted appropriation. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended \$1.048 billion for the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance account for FY2012, which included \$79.9 million for OJP's salaries and expenses. This amount was 10.7% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 6.3% less than the FY2011 appropriation. The Administration requested a total of \$1.174 billion for the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance account for FY2012, which was \$55.7 million, or 5.0%, more than the FY2011 appropriation for this account (\$1.118 billion).

As a part of the FY2012 request for the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance account, the Administration did not request funding for both the drug court and mental health court programs. Rather, the Administration requested \$57.0 million for a proposed drug, mental health, and problem-solving courts program. Under the program, OJP would have had, according to the Administration, “increased flexibility in funding innovative projects [to] help state, local, and tribal governments develop and implement evidence-based problem solving courts strategies to address their unique needs.”¹⁰⁶ Congress ultimately rejected the Administration’s proposal and chose to provide \$9.0 million for mental health courts and \$35.0 million for drug courts.

The Administration also requested funding a proposed Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation (BCJI) program. This program would replace and build upon the Weed and Seed program (the Weed and Seed program was not funded for FY2011). Like Weed and Seed, the proposed BCJI program is a community-based strategy to control and prevent violent crime, drug abuse, and gang activity in designated high-crime neighborhoods by providing funding to support partnerships between law enforcement agencies and community-based organizations that provide prevention, intervention, and neighborhood restoration services. The program will utilize evidence-based strategies in order to expand knowledge of what efforts and services do and do not work to prevent crime. The program will also include a significant emphasis on interagency collaboration. Congress accepted the Administration’s proposal and provided \$15.0 million for the BCJI program for FY2012.

Table 7. Funding for State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs
(budget authority in millions of dollars)

Program	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Request	House Committee Reported	Senate- Passed	FY2012 Enacted
Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grants	\$429.9	\$519.0	\$356.9	\$395.0	\$470.0
Transfer to the National Institute of Justice	4.1	—	—	—	—
State and Local Intelligence Training	2.5	2.0	—	3.0	2.0
Bulletproof Vests Grant Program ^a	—	30.0	—	—	—
Domestic Radicalization Research	—	—	5.0	—	4.0
Criminal Justice Reform and Recidivism Reduction	—	—	6.0	—	6.0
Presidential Nominating Convention Security	—	—	4.0	—	100.0
State and Local Assistance Help Desk and Diagnostic Center	—	—	—	4.0	4.0
Smart Probation	—	—	—	5.0	—
VALOR Initiative	—	—	—	3.0	2.0
Byrne Competitive Grants	33.1	25.0	15.0	21.0	15.0
State Criminal Justice Reform and Recidivism Reduction	8.3	—	—	—	—
John R. Justice Grant Program	8.3	—	—	5.0	4.0
Tribal Assistance	41.4	—	41.5	—	38.0

¹⁰⁶ U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, *FY2012 Performance Budget*, p. 56, <http://www.justice.gov/jmd/2012justification/pdf/fy12-ojp-justification.pdf>.

Program	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Request	House Committee Reported	Senate- Passed	FY2012 Enacted
Detention Facilities	8.3	—	8.3	—	—
Courts	20.7	—	20.8	—	—
Alcohol and Substance Abuse	9.9	—	10.0	—	—
Legal Assistance	2.5	—	2.5	—	—
State Criminal Alien Assistance Program	273.4	136.0	—	273.0	240.0
Southwest Border Prosecutions	25.7	—	25.7	—	—
Northern Border Prosecutions	2.5	—	—	—	—
Border Prosecution Initiatives	—	—	—	20.0	10.0
Victims of Trafficking Grants	10.4	10.0	10.5	10.5	10.5
Residential Substance Abuse Treatment	24.9	30.0	15.0	10.0	10.0
Mentally Ill Offenders Act	9.9	—	10.0	9.0	9.0
Drug Courts	37.3	—	40.0	35.0	35.0
Prescription Drug Monitoring	5.8	—	7.0	—	7.0
Prison Rape Prevention and Prosecution	12.4	5.0	12.5	—	12.5
Justice for All—Capital Litigation/ Wrongful Conviction Review	4.6	5.5	1.0	4.0	3.0
Missing Alzheimer's Patient Grants	1.7	—	2.0	—	1.0
Economic, High-tech and Cybercrime Prevention	16.6	—	4.0	10.0	7.0
CASA-Special Advocates	12.4	—	6.0	2.5	4.5
Training for Judicial Personnel ^c	2.1	—	—	1.5	—
Stalking Database	2.5	—	—	—	—
Research on Violence Against Indian Women ^d	1.0	—	—	—	—
Training Program to Assist Probation and Parole Officers	2.9	—	—	—	—
Closed Circuit Television Grants	1.0	—	—	—	—
Second Chance Act	82.8	100.0	69.9	—	63.0
Violent Gang and Gun Crime Reduction	12.4	12.5	—	10.0	5.0
National Instant Criminal Background Check System Grants	16.6	12.0	5.0	10.0	5.0
National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP)	9.5	12.0	6.0	8.0	6.0
Paul Coverdell Forensic Science Grants	29.0	—	—	15.0	12.0
Drug, Mental Health, and Problem- solving Courts	—	57.0	—	—	—
Initiative to Support Evidence-based Policing	—	10.0	—	—	—
Assistance to Improve the Functioning of the Criminal Justice System	—	8.0	—	—	—

Program	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Request	House Committee Reported	Senate- Passed	FY2012 Enacted
Justice Information Sharing and Technology Program	—	12.0	—	—	—
Implementation of the Adam Walsh Act	—	30.0	—	23.0	20.0
Programs for Children Exposed to Violence	—	25.0	—	10.0	10.0
Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation Program	—	30.0	—	20.0	15.0
Regional Information Sharing System ^b	—	17.5	—	—	—
National Sex Offender Public Website ^a	—	1.0	—	1.0	1.0
Training and Technical Assistance Initiative for Law Enforcement on Domestic Radicalization	—	2.5	—	—	—
Preventing Violence Against Law Enforcement Officer Resilience and Survivability Initiative	—	3.5	—	—	—
National Forum on Youth Violence Prevention ^c	—	—	—	3.0	—
Bulletproof Vests Grant Program ^a	—	—	24.9	24.9	24.0
JJDPa Part B—State Formula ^c	—	—	40.0	—	—
Youth Mentoring Grants ^c	—	—	82.9	—	—
Investigation and Prosecution of Child Abuse Programs ^c	—	—	15.0	—	—
Methamphetamine Hot-spots/Transfer to the Drug Enforcement Administration ^a	—	—	15.0	—	—
DNA Backlog Reduction ^a	—	110.0	133.5	131.0	125.0
Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grants	—	—	125.2	123.0	117.0
Post-conviction DNA Testing Grants	—	—	4.2	4.0	4.0
Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners	—	—	4.2	4.0	4.0
Tribal Resources Grant Program ^a	—	—	20.0	—	—
Child Sexual Predator Program ^a	—	—	9.0	—	—
General State and Local Assistance	—	—	—	11.1	—
OJP Salaries and Expenses ^e	—	—	79.9	—	—
Total: State and Local Law Enforcement	1,117.8	1,173.5	1,047.9	1,063.5	1,162.5

Source: FY2011-enacted amounts are based on a CRS analysis of the text of P.L. 112-10. FY2012-requested amounts were taken from the Office of Justice Program's FY2012 Congressional budget submission. House committee-reported amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-169. Senate-passed amounts were taken from H.R. 2112, as passed by the Senate. FY2012-enacted amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-284.

Note: Amounts may not add to totals due to rounding. The House committee-reported amounts include the 0.1% rescission specified in Section 543 of H.R. 2596.

- a. See **Table 9**.
- b. See **Table 6**.
- c. See **Table 8**.

- d. See **Table 5**.
- e. The Senate-passed bill includes \$20.6 million for OJP's salaries and expenses in a separate OJP Salaries and Expenses account.

Juvenile Justice Programs

The Juvenile Justice Programs account includes funding for grant programs to reduce juvenile delinquency and help state, local, and tribal governments improve the functioning of their juvenile justice systems. The FY2012-enacted appropriation provides \$262.5 million for the Juvenile Justice Programs account. This is 4.6% more than the \$250.0 million that would have been provided by the Senate. The FY2012-enacted appropriation is 6.3% less than the \$280.0 million that the Administration had requested for FY2012 and 4.7% less than the FY2011-enacted appropriation of \$275.4 million.

The Senate recommended \$251.0 million for juvenile justice programs for FY2012. This amount would have been 8.9% less than the FY2011-enacted level of \$275.4 million and 10.4% less than the \$280.0 million requested by the Administration for FY2012. See **Table 8** for details on the Senate Committee on Appropriations' recommendations for FY2012 juvenile justice funding. For FY2012, the House Committee on Appropriations did not recommend funding for juvenile justice programs under a separate Juvenile Justice Programs account. Instead, several programs that had been previously funded under this account—including the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) Part B Formula Grants, Juvenile Justice Youth Mentoring Grants, and Investigation and Prosecution of Child Abuse Programs—would have been funded under the Office of Justice Programs' State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance account. See **Table 7** for proposed funding.

For FY2012, the Administration's request included \$280.0 million for the Juvenile Justice Programs account, almost \$4.6 million (or 1.7%) more than the \$275.4 million appropriated for this account for FY2011. For FY2012, the Administration's request included a proposal for a new Race to the Top-style Juvenile Incentive System Improvement Grant that would have consolidated existing juvenile justice formula funding from the JJDP Part B Formula Grants program as well as the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG) program. This new program would have been aimed at incentivizing states for making progress on certain indicators in the juvenile justice system. Proposed funding would only have been available for states in compliance with core mandates from the JJDP.¹⁰⁷ Congress did not accept the Administration's proposal.

¹⁰⁷ In an April 1, 2011, press release, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) announced that it was amending its FY2012 proposal for the Juvenile Justice System Incentive Grant Program. Instead of requesting \$120 million for the program, OJJDP proposed that the FY2012 request for the Juvenile Justice Programs account include \$80 million for Part B Formula Grants, \$30 million for JABG, and \$10 million for a demonstration program to encourage innovation and juvenile justice system improvements. The amendment was prompted by feedback OJJDP received from states, the juvenile justice community, and congressional offices. However, the Administration has not submitted a formal amendment to its FY2012 request for the Juvenile Justice Programs account. As such, **Table 8** reflects the Administration's original request for FY2012 funding for the Juvenile Justice Programs account. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *Administration Revises Proposal on Race to the Top Funding for Juvenile Justice*, April 1, 2011, <http://www.ojjdp.gov/enews/11juvjust/110401.html>.

Table 8. Funding for Juvenile Justice Programs
(budget authority in millions of dollars)

Program	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Request	House Committee Reported	Senate- Passed	FY2012 Enacted
Part B—State Formula ^a	\$62.1	—	—	\$45.0	\$40.0
Youth Mentoring Grants ^a	82.8	45.0	—	55.0	78.0
Title V—Incentive Grants	53.8	62.0	—	33.0	20.0
Tribal Youth	20.7	—	—	15.0	10.0
Gang Prevention	8.3	—	—	8.0	5.0
Alcohol Use Prevention	20.7	—	—	10.0	5.0
Incentive Grants	4.1	—	—	—	—
Investigation and Prosecution of Child Abuse Programs ^a	18.6	20.0	—	20.0	18.0
Juvenile Accountability Block Grants	45.6	—	—	30.0	30.0
Community-based Violence Prevention Initiative	8.2	15.0	—	8.0	8.0
Training for Judicial Personnel ^a	—	—	—	—	1.5
Safe Start	4.1	—	—	—	—
Gang and Youth Violence Prevention and Intervention	—	12.0	—	—	—
Juvenile Justice System Incentive Grant Program	—	120.0	—	—	—
Grants and Technical Assistance in Support of the National Forum on Youth Violence Prevention	—	6.0	—	—	—
Missing and Exploited Children Programs ^b	—	—	—	60.0	65.0
National Forum on Youth Violence Prevention ^a	—	—	—	—	2.0 ^a
Total: Juvenile Justice Programs	275.4	280.0	—	251.0	262.5

Source: FY2011-enacted amounts are based on a CRS analysis of the text of P.L. 112-10. FY2012-requested amounts were taken from the Office of Justice Program's FY2012 Congressional budget submission. House committee-reported amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-169. Senate-passed amounts were taken from H.R. 2112, as passed by the Senate. FY2012-enacted amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-284.

Note: Amounts may not add to totals due to rounding.

a. See **Table 7**.

b. See **Table 6**.

Public Safety Officers Benefits Program (PSOB)

The PSOB program provides three different types of benefits to public safety officers and their survivors: death, disability, and education. The PSOB program is intended to assist in the recruitment and retention of law enforcement officers, firefighters, and first responders and to offer peace of mind to men and women who choose careers in public safety. Congress provides \$78.3 million for this program for FY2012, the same as the amount recommended by both the Senate and the House Committee on Appropriations and the same as the Administration's request.

The FY2012 appropriation for PSOB is 11.7% more than the FY2011 appropriation of \$70.1 million.

Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS)

The COPS Office awards grants to state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies throughout the United States so they can hire and train law enforcement officers to participate in community policing, purchase and deploy new crime-fighting technologies, and develop and test new and innovative policing strategies. Some examples of grant programs traditionally funded under this account include the Law Enforcement Technology grant program, the Methamphetamine Hot-Spots Initiative, and grants to reduce the DNA backlog. For FY2012, Congress provides \$198.5 million for the Community Oriented Policing Services account, an amount that is 14.3% less than the Senate's recommendation, 70.4% less than the Administration's request, and 59.9% less than the FY2011-enacted appropriation. As mentioned above, Congress provided funding for DNA backlog reduction programs and the Bulletproof Vests Grant program, both of which have traditionally been funded under the Community Oriented Policing Services account, under the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance account for FY2012.

The Senate recommended \$231.5 million for COPS for FY2012. This amount was 65.4% less than the Administration's request and 53.2% less than the FY2011-appropriation. The House Committee on Appropriations did not include any funding for the Community Oriented Policing Services account in the FY2012 CJS bill. Rather, the committee recommend funding for some traditional COPS programs under the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance account. For FY2012, the Administration requested \$669.5 million for COPS, which was 35.3% more than the FY2011 appropriation of \$494.9 million.

Table 9. Funding for Community Oriented Policing Services Programs

(budget authority in millions of dollars)

Program	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Request	House Committee Reported	Senate- Passed	FY2012 Enacted
COPS Hiring Program	\$246.8	\$600.0	—	\$200.0	\$166.0
Tribal Resources Grant Program	—	—	—	28.0	15.0
Community Policing Development	—	—	—	10.0	10.0
COPS Technology and Interoperability	1.2	—	—	—	—
Transfer to the National Institute of Standards and Technology	1.2	—	—	1.5	—
Methamphetamine Hot Spots	12.4	—	—	10.0	12.5
Transfer to the Drug Enforcement Administration ^a	8.3	—	—	10.0	12.5
Tribal Meth Enforcement Grants	4.1	—	—	—	—
Tribal Resources Grant Program ^a	33.1	20.0	—	20.0	20.0
Bullet-proof Vests Grant Program ^a	24.9	—	—	—	—
Transfer to the National Institute of Standards and Technology	1.2	—	—	—	—
DNA Backlog Reduction ^a	133.4	—	—	—	—
Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grants	125.1	—	—	—	—
Post-conviction DNA Testing Grants	4.1	—	—	—	—
Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners	4.1	—	—	—	—
Child Sexual Predator Elimination/ Sex Offender Management	19.9	9.0	—	—	—
Sex Offender Management ^a	9.1	—	—	—	—
National Sex Offender Public Website ^a	1.0	—	—	—	—
Secure Our Schools Act	13.3	10.0	—	—	—
Community Policing Development	9.9	20.5	—	—	—
Police Integrity Initiative	—	10.0	—	—	—
Total: Community Oriented Policing Services	494.9	669.5	—	231.5	198.5

Source: FY2012-enacted amounts are based on a CRS analysis of the text of P.L. 112-10. FY2012-requested amounts were taken from the Community Oriented Policing Services Office's FY2012 Congressional budget submission. House committee-reported amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-169. Senate-passed amounts were taken from H.R. 2112, as passed by the Senate. FY2012-enacted amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-284.

Note: Amounts may not add to totals due to rounding.

a. See **Table 7**.

The Administration, as a part of its \$669.5 million request for COPS for FY2012, requested \$600.0 million for hiring programs, compared to the \$246.8 million Congress appropriated for the same purpose for FY2011. One issue before Congress as it considered the FY2012 appropriation

for COPS was whether to fund the Administration's request for \$600.0 million for hiring programs. The COPS Office reported that it received nearly 7,300 applications requesting a total of \$8.3 billion to fund the hiring or retention of 39,000 police officers when it opened a solicitation to award the \$1.0 billion it received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5).¹⁰⁸ The COPS Office used the \$298.0 million Congress appropriated for hiring programs for FY2010 to award grants to the more than 6,100 agencies that applied for stimulus funding but did not receive awards.¹⁰⁹ However, as discussed above, there has been debate about funding for non-security discretionary spending, and if Congress chooses to reduce funding for DOJ, appropriations for some programs will have to be reduced or eliminated. Opponents of continuing funding for the COPS hiring program assert that law enforcement is largely the providence of state and local governments; therefore, they should be responsible for paying the salaries of police officers. Proponents of continuing funding for the program argue that there is a national interest in providing for the safety and security of U.S. citizens, hence Congress should help state and local governments hire new police officers. Ultimately Congress chose to provide some funding for hiring programs (\$166.0 million), though it was 72.3% below the Administration's request of \$600.0 million.

Salaries and Expenses for OVW, OJP, and COPS

This account provides for the salaries and expenses of OVW, OJP, and COPS. This account was funded for the first time in FY2009. Congress established a Salaries and Expenses account for OVW, OJP, and COPS to "achieve greater transparency, efficiency and accountability in the management, administration and oversight of the Justice Department grant programs."¹¹⁰ Congress did not provide any funding for this account for FY2012. In addition, neither the Senate or House Committee on Appropriations proposed funding for a separate salaries and expenses account for OVW, OJP, and COPS. Rather, the Senate-passed bill included funding for OVW, OJP, and COPS salaries and expenses under separate accounts while the House committee-reported bill included funding for OVW and OJP's salaries and expenses under, respectively, the OVW and State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance accounts. The FY2012 request for this account was \$271.8 million, or 45.7% more than the FY2011 appropriation of \$186.6 million.

Science Agencies¹¹¹

The Science Agencies fund and otherwise support research and development (R&D) and related activities across a wide variety of federal missions, including national competitiveness, climate change, energy and the environment, and fundamental discovery.

FY2011 and FY2012 Appropriations

The FY2012-enacted appropriation for the science agencies is \$24.838 billion. This amount is 0.8% more than the amount recommended by the Senate and 5.0% more than the House

¹⁰⁸ U.S. Department of Justice, Community Oriented Policing Services Office, *2009 COPS Hiring Recovery Program Post-award Frequently Asked Questions*, <http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/Default.asp?Item=2265>.

¹⁰⁹ U.S. Department of Justice, Community Oriented Policing Services, *COPS Hiring Program (CHP), Background and Award Methodology*, <http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/Default.asp?Item=2552>.

¹¹⁰ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, *Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009*, committee print, 111th Cong., 1st sess., March 2009, Book 1 of 2 – Divisions A-E (Washington: GPO, 2009), p. 342.

¹¹¹ This section was coordinated by John F. Sargent, Jr., Specialist in Science and Technology Policy; CRS Resources, Science, and Industry Division.

Committee on Appropriation's recommendation. However, the FY2012 appropriation is 6.3% below the Administration's request and 1.9% below the FY2011 appropriation. The Senate recommended a total of \$24.643 billion for the science agencies, which was 4.2% more than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, but 7.0% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 2.7% below the FY2011 appropriation. The bill reported by the House Committee on Appropriations included a total of \$23.649 billion for the science agencies. This amount was \$2.848 billion, or 10.7%, less than the Administration's FY2012 request and \$1.665, or 6.6%, less than the FY2011-enacted amount. For FY2012, the Administration requested a total of \$26.498 billion for the science agencies, which included \$18.724 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and \$7.767 billion for the National Science Foundation. The FY2012 request was 4.7% greater than the FY2011 appropriation of \$25.315 billion.

Table 10. Funding for Science Agencies
(budget authority in millions of dollars)

Accounts	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Request	House Committee Reported	Senate- Passed	FY2012 Enacted
Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP)	\$6.6	\$6.7	\$3.0	\$6.0	\$4.5
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)	18,448.0	18,724.3	16,793.4	17,938.8	17,800.0
National Science Foundation (NSF)	6,859.9	7,767.0	6,853.0	6,698.1	7,033.1
Total: Science Agencies	25,314.5	26,498.0	23,649.5	24,642.9	24,837.6

Source: FY2011-enacted amounts, FY2012-requested amounts, and House committee-reported amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-169. Senate-passed amounts were taken from H.R. 2112, as passed by the Senate. FY2012-enacted amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-284.

Note: Amounts may not add to totals due to rounding. The House committee-reported amounts include the 0.1% rescission specified in Section 543 of H.R. 2596.

Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP)¹¹²

Congress established the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) through the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (P.L. 94-282). The act states that “the primary function of the OSTP director is to provide, within the Executive Office of the President, advice on the scientific, engineering, and technological aspects of issues that require attention at the highest level of Government.” The OSTP director, often referred to informally as the President’s science advisor, also manages the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC),¹¹³ which coordinates science and technology policy across the federal government, and co-chairs the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST),¹¹⁴ a council of external advisors that provides advice to the President on matters related

¹¹² This section was prepared by Dana A. Shea, Specialist in Science and Technology Policy, Resources, Science, and Industry Division.

¹¹³ The National Science and Technology Council was established by Executive Order 12881.

¹¹⁴ The President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology was established by Executive Order 13226.

to science and technology policy. OSTP is one of two offices in the Executive Office of the President (EOP) that is funded in the CJS appropriations bill.¹¹⁵

Section 1340(a) of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 112-10) prohibited OSTP from expending funds

to develop, design, plan, promulgate, implement, or execute a bilateral policy, program, order, or contract of any kind to participate, collaborate, or coordinate bilaterally in any way with China or any Chinese-owned company unless such activities are specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of enactment of this division.

According to OSTP Director John Holdren, OSTP had concluded after consultation with the Department of Justice that “certain applications of section 1340 ... would infringe upon the President’s constitutional authority to conduct foreign diplomacy.”¹¹⁶ In October 2011, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) concluded that

OSTP’s use of appropriations to fund its participation in the [U.S.-China Dialogue on Innovation Policy] and [U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue] violated the prohibition in section 1340. In addition, because section 1340 prohibited the use of OSTP’s appropriations for this purpose, OSTP’s involvement in the Innovation Dialogue and the S&ED resulted in obligations in excess of appropriated funds available to OSTP; as such, OSTP violated the Antideficiency Act, 31 U.S.C. § 1341(a)(1)(A).¹¹⁷

The chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, has written the Attorney General conveying his expectation that the Attorney General will ensure comprehensive enforcement of Section 1340(a) of P.L. 112-10 and hold OSTP Director Holdren to full account for his actions.¹¹⁸

For FY2012, the conference agreement provides \$4.5 million for OSTP. This amount is 25.0% less than provided by the Senate, 50.2% greater than recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, 32.3% less than the Administration’s FY2012 request, and 32.3% less than the FY2011-enacted amount.

Both report and statutory language continue the prohibition restricting any OSTP activities that would carry the risk of transfer of sensitive technology to China. In contrast with the FY2011 language, Section 539 allows OSTP to proceed with activities that it certifies pose no risk of transfer. Such certification must be submitted to the House and Senate Committees at least 14 days prior to the activity in question.

The conference agreement supports OSTP efforts to develop a federal science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education strategic plan and encourage inclusion of goals for improved dissemination of STEM education research results and best practices. The conference agreement also encourages OSTP to establish an NSTC working group to coordinate federal investments in neuroscience research.

¹¹⁵ The other EOP office funded under the CJS appropriations bill is the Office of the United States Trade Representative.

¹¹⁶ Chairman Frank R. Wolf, *Questions for the Record, Office of Science and Technology Policy*, Hearing on May 4, 2011, available in *Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 2012*, committee print, prepared by U.S. Government Printing Office, 112th Cong., 1st sess., May 4, 2011 (Washington: GPO, 2011), pp. 316-328.

¹¹⁷ Government Accountability Office, *Office of Science and Technology Policy—Bilateral Activities with China*, B-321982, October 11, 2011, p. 1.

¹¹⁸ Letter from Rep. Frank Wolf, Chairman, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representative, to Dr. John Holdren, Director, Office of Science and Technology Policy, October 13, 2011.

The Senate would have provided \$6.0 million for OSTP. This amount would have been 100.2% greater than recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, 9.8% less than the Administration's FY2012 request, and 9.7% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. The Senate committee report directs OSTP to remain engaged with international partners in order to pursue large projects "frugally, in partnership."

The House Committee on Appropriations would have provided \$3.0 million for OSTP. This amount would have been 54.9% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 54.9% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. The House committee report directs OSTP to prioritize its funding toward coordinating and improving government programs in STEM education.

For FY2012, the Administration requested \$6.7 million, \$3,000 (0.0%) above its FY2011-enacted level. According to OSTP Director John Holdren, the request recognized "the need for shared sacrifice to freeze non-security discretionary spending."¹¹⁹ The request would have supported four Senate-confirmed associate directors.¹²⁰ The NSF again requested FY2012 funding for the Science and Technology Policy Institute (STPI, \$3.1 million, an increase of \$100,000 (3.3%) from FY2010), a federally-funded research and development center that supports OSTP. FY2011-enacted appropriations for OSTP were \$6.6 million. Appropriations for STPI fall below the appropriations-account level and thus were not identified.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)¹²¹

NASA was created by the 1958 National Aeronautics and Space Act (P.L. 85-568) to conduct civilian space and aeronautics activities. The agency is managed from headquarters in Washington, DC. It has nine major field centers around the country, plus the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, which is operated under contract by the California Institute of Technology.

The Administration requested \$18.724 billion for NASA for FY2012. This was 1.5% more than the \$18.448 billion appropriated for FY2011 and 3.7% less than the \$19.450 billion authorized for FY2012 in the NASA Authorization Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-267). The House Committee on Appropriations recommended \$16.793 billion. The Senate bill would have provided \$17.939 billion. The final appropriation was \$17.800 billion. See **Table 11** for a breakdown of each of these amounts by appropriations account.

The Administration's \$5.017 billion request for NASA's Science account in FY2012 was a 1.6% increase from the enacted FY2011 amount. Within this total, the \$1.797 billion requested for Earth Science included continuation of a global climate research initiative first proposed in FY2011 and support for the development and launch of several missions recommended by the National Academies in the 2007 decadal survey.¹²² An independent review of the James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) in October 2010 estimated that the project was 15 months behind schedule and \$1.4 billion over budget.¹²³ The revised JWST program NASA developed in

¹¹⁹ Testimony of Dr. John P. Holdren, Director, Office of Science and Technology Policy, Executive Office of the President of the United States, before the House Committee on Science, Space and Technology, February 17, 2011.

¹²⁰ The OSTP associate director for technology also serves as Chief Technology Officer.

¹²¹ This section was prepared by Daniel Morgan, Specialist in Science and Technology Policy, Resources, Science, and Industry Division.

¹²² National Research Council, *Earth Science and Applications from Space: National Imperatives for the Next Decade and Beyond*, 2007, <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/11820.html>.

¹²³ Final report of the JWST Independent Comprehensive Review Panel, October 29, 2010, http://www.nasa.gov/pdf/499224main_JWST-ICRP_Report-FINAL.pdf; and GAO, *NASA: Assessment of Selected Large-Scale Projects*, GAO-11-239SP, March 2011, <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d11239sp.pdf>.

response to this finding includes an estimated total lifecycle cost of \$8.835 billion and a launch date in 2018.¹²⁴ The House committee recommended \$4.499 billion for Science, including \$1.697 billion for Earth Science and no funding for JWST. The Senate bill would have provided \$5.100 billion for Science, including \$1.766 billion for Earth Science and \$530 million for JWST (more than the FY2012 request of \$355 million). The final bill provided \$5.090 billion, including the same amount as the Senate bill for both Earth Science and JWST. It capped the formulation and development cost of JWST at \$8 billion and directed GAO to assess the JWST program continuously and report on it annually.

The request for Aeronautics was \$569 million, an increase of 6.6% from the FY2011-enacted amount. The request included increases for selected research topics in categories identified by the 2010 authorization act (P.L. 111-267, §902). The requested funding for hypersonics was reduced and focused on foundational research. The House committee recommended the requested amount. It supported NASA's plan to reduce hypersonics funding and increase funding for other topics. The Senate bill would have provided \$501 million. The Senate Committee on Appropriations stated that this amount included full funding for aviation safety and unmanned aircraft systems. It did not state which other research areas should receive less than the request. The final appropriation was \$570 million.

For Space Technology, the Administration requested \$1.024 billion. About half of this total (\$497 million) was for Crosscutting Space Technology Development, a mostly new activity. The request for this activity was comparable to the amount authorized for Space Technology by the 2010 authorization act (\$486 million). Most of the remainder of the request for Space Technology would be for two activities transferred from other accounts: Exploration Technology Development from the Exploration account and Small Business Innovation Research from the Cross-Agency Support account. The request proposed roughly doubling the funding for both these transferred activities. The House committee recommended \$375 million for Space Technology. It suggested that ongoing planning and prioritization efforts "will put the program in a stronger position to seek additional resources in future requests." The Senate bill would have provided \$637 million, including \$210 million for Crosscutting Space Technology. The Senate committee expressed regret at "not being able to fund this promising new program more robustly." The final appropriation was \$575 million, to be "prioritized toward the continuation of ongoing programs and activities."

The Administration's request for Exploration in FY2012 was \$3.949 billion, a 3.9% increase over FY2011. In recent years, the bulk of this account funded the Constellation program, including development of the Orion crew vehicle and Ares I rocket for carrying humans into low Earth orbit and the heavy-lift Ares V cargo rocket and other systems needed for a human mission to the Moon. In FY2012, the account instead funds development of the Multipurpose Crew Vehicle (MPCV) and heavy-lift Space Launch System (SLS) mandated by the 2010 authorization act. Although this is a substantial change, many elements of Orion and Ares are included in the MPCV and SLS. The request included \$916 million for the MPCV and \$1.690 billion for the SLS, substantially less than the authorized amounts of \$1.400 billion and \$2.650 billion. On the other hand, it also included \$850 million to help companies develop commercial crew transport services to low Earth orbit, substantially more than the authorized amount of \$500 million. The House committee recommended \$3.645 billion for Exploration, including \$1.062 billion for the MPCV, \$1.983 billion for the SLS, and \$312 million for commercial crew. The Senate bill would have provided \$3.775 billion, including \$1.2 billion for the MPCV, \$1.8 billion for the SLS, and \$500 million for commercial crew. The final appropriation was \$3.771 billion, including \$1.200

¹²⁴ H.Rept. 112-284, p. 254. Full details of the JWST replan are expected to be released in February 2012 as part of the FY2013 budget request.

billion for the MPCV, \$1.860 billion for the SLS, and \$406 million for commercial crew. The conference report directed NASA to develop “a set of science-based exploration goals; a target destination or destinations that will enable the achievement of those goals; a schedule for the proposed attainment of those goals; and a plan for any proposed collaboration with international partners.”

The FY2012 request of \$4.347 billion for Space Operations, which funds the space shuttle, the International Space Station (ISS), and the Space and Flight Support program, was a 20.9% decrease from the FY2011-enacted amount, but 5.0% more than the authorized amount. The requested funding for the space shuttle program was \$665 million, a reduction of 58.3%. The last shuttle flight was completed in July 2011. Most FY2012 funding for the space shuttle program will be devoted to covering a shortfall in the defined benefit pension plan of the contractor that managed shuttle operations. The House committee recommended \$4.060 billion for Space Operations, including \$547 million for the shuttle program. The Senate bill would have provided \$4.285 billion, including \$651 million for the shuttle program. The final appropriation was \$4.234 billion, including \$573 million for the shuttle program.

Table 11. Funding for NASA
(budget authority in millions of dollars)

Accounts	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Authorized	FY2012 Request	House Committee Reported	Senate-Passed	FY2012 Enacted
Science	\$4,935.4	\$5,248.6	\$5,016.8	\$4,499.5	\$5,100.0	\$5,090.0
Aeronautics and Space Research and Technology	533.9	584.7	569.4	569.4	501.0	569.9
Space Technology	—	486.0	1,024.2	374.6	637.0	575.0
Exploration	3,800.7	5,252.3	3,948.7	3,645.4	3,775.0	3,770.8
Space Operations	5,497.5	4,141.5	4,346.9	4,059.9	4,285.0	4,233.6
Education	145.5	145.8	138.4	137.9	138.4	138.4
Cross-Agency Support	3,105.2	3,189.6	3,192.0	3,047.0	3,043.1	2,995.0
Construction and Environmental Compliance and Restoration	393.5	363.8	450.4	423.6	422.0	390.0
Inspector General	36.3	37.8	37.5	36.3	37.3	37.3
Total: NASA	18,448.0	19,450.0	18,724.3	16,793.4	17,938.8	17,800.0

Source: FY2011-enacted amounts, FY2012-requested amounts, and House committee-reported amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-169. FY2012-authorized amounts taken from P.L. 111-267. Senate-passed amounts were taken from H.R. 2112, as passed by the Senate. FY2012-enacted amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-284.

Note: The House committee-reported amounts include the 0.1% rescission specified in Section 543 of H.R. 2596.

National Science Foundation (NSF)¹²⁵

The National Science Foundation (NSF) supports basic research and education in the non-medical sciences and engineering. Congress established the Foundation as an independent federal agency

¹²⁵ This section was prepared by Heather B. Gonzalez, Specialist in Science and Technology Policy, Resources,

in 1950 and directed it to “promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.”¹²⁶ The NSF is a primary source of federal support for U.S. university research. It is also responsible for significant shares of the federal science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education program portfolio and federal STEM student aid and support.

P.L. 112-55 provides a total of \$7.033 billion for the NSF in FY2012. This amount is \$335.0 million (5.0%) more than the Senate-passed total of \$6.698 billion, \$180.1 million (2.6%) more than the House Committee on Appropriations’ recommendation of \$6.853 billion, \$733.9 billion (9.4%) less than the President’s request for \$7.767 billion, and \$173.2 million (2.5%) more than the FY2011-enacted amount of \$6.860 billion.¹²⁷ Compared to the distribution of enacted funding across NSF accounts in FY2011, P.L. 112-55 shifts about 0.9% of the Foundation’s budget to research and construction activities from education and agency operations. This change appears to reflect the position of the House Appropriations Committee’s recommendation, which increased funding for the research, combined with the Senate’s position, which increased funding for construction. The Administration’s FY2012 request for NSF increased all major accounts over FY2011 levels.

A primary concern in the FY2012 congressional debate about funding for NSF centered on the so-called “doubling path” policy.¹²⁸ Since 2006, federal policymakers have sought to increase support for research in the physical sciences and engineering. To that end, they have sought to double aggregate funding for the NSF, NIST laboratories and construction accounts, and the DOE Office of Science (collectively, the “targeted accounts”), which many policymakers perceive as key to U.S. innovation and competitiveness.

The status of the doubling path policy for NSF and the other targeted accounts is now uncertain. FY2011-enacted funding for the targeted accounts set a pace for a 15-year doubling—more than twice the length of time originally envisioned in the 2007 America COMPETES Act and about a third longer than the doubling period established by the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010.¹²⁹ Although the President’s FY2012 budget request initially sought funding for targeted accounts consistent with a 12-year doubling period, the Administration’s September 1, 2011, *Mid-Session Review* acknowledged that the doubling goal would need to be delayed. Enacted and proposed FY2012 appropriations for targeted accounts would reduce the average annual growth rate from the FY2011 pace. The aggregate FY2012-enacted and currently proposed appropriations levels for the targeted accounts would result in a doubling pace in excess of 17 years.¹³⁰

Another issue raised in the congressional debate about funding for NSF focused on the Foundation’s ability to effectively manage expenditures. In a February 10, 2011, House hearing, NSF’s Inspector General Allison C. Lerner testified that—among other issues—NSF’s grant oversight program has limited practical effect and that the Foundation faces ongoing challenges

Science, and Industry Division.

¹²⁶ The National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (P.L. 81-507), Purpose.

¹²⁷ FY2011-enacted amounts include a \$54.0 million transfer to the U.S. Coast Guard for icebreaking services.

¹²⁸ For more information on the doubling path policy, see CRS Report R41951, *An Analysis of Efforts to Double Federal Funding for Physical Sciences and Engineering Research*, by John F. Sargent Jr.

¹²⁹ All doubling path calculations in this report use FY2006 as the baseline.

¹³⁰ Based on enacted appropriations for targeted accounts at the NSF and NIST contained in P.L. 112-55 and on proposed funding for the DOE Office of Science included in H.R. 2354 as amended and reported from the Senate Committee on Appropriations on September 7, 2011.

in ensuring that grant recipients comply with grant terms and conditions. According to Lerner's testimony, the NSF attributes this problem, at least in part, to staffing constraints. However, Lerner postulated that, "If the Foundation's budget continues to grow, the resulting increase in awards to monitor will compound this challenge."¹³¹

The Senate Committee on Appropriations raised related concerns about accountability at NSF in its report on S. 1572 (S.Rept. 112-78). Consistent with the committee's general concerns about waste, fraud, and abuse at all the "departments, agencies, boards and commissions funded in this bill,"¹³² the Senate provided a \$200,000 increase (1.6%) over FY2011-enacted levels (\$14.0 million) for the Foundation's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) "to enhance accountability at the NSF."¹³³ The final agreement on FY2012 CJS appropriations reflects the Senate position and provides the OIG with \$14.2 million in FY2012. The Administration's FY2012 request for the OIG was \$15.0 million. The House Committee on Appropriations' recommended holding the OIG account at FY2011 levels and encouraged the OIG to focus on oversight activity with potential monetary ramifications.

NSF organizes its budget into six primary accounts: Research and Related Activities (RRA), Education and Human Resources (EHR), Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction (MREFC), Agency Operations and Award Management (AOAM), the National Science Board (NSB), and the OIG. The RRA, EHR, and MREFC accounts represent the core of the NSF's research and education program activities and funding.¹³⁴

P.L. 112-55 provides \$5.719 billion for the RRA account in FY2012. This amount is \$276.0 million (5.1%) more than the Senate-passed total of \$5.443 billion, \$117.6 million (2.1%) more than the House Committee on Appropriations' recommendation of \$5.601 billion, \$534.5 billion (8.5%) less than the President's request for \$6.254 billion, and \$155.1 million (2.5%) more than the FY2011-enacted amount of \$5.564 billion. P.L. 112-55 provides \$150.9 million in RRA funds for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) program (\$4.1 million more than FY2011 enacted), permits NSF to transfer up to \$50.0 million from the RRA account to MREFC, and allows NSF to use RRA funds to reimburse other federal agencies for support of the U.S. Antarctic program.

The conference report on H.R. 2112 (which became P.L. 112-55) endorses Administration-proposed reductions to RRA programs in FY2012 except for the proposed changes to the Radio Astronomy program. It also adopts language from H.Rept. 112-169 that supports planned NSF activities in advanced manufacturing and agrees to language from S.Rept. 112-78 that provided \$165.6 million for cybersecurity research. Other RRA account provisions included in FY2012 CJS appropriations bill reports include provisions encouraging the Foundation to sustain and

¹³¹ Testimony of NSF Inspector General Allison C. Lerner, in U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, *Oversight of the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)*, hearings, 112th Cong., 1st sess., February 11, 2011, p. 3, http://appropriations.house.gov/_files/NSFIGAllisonCLerner.pdf.

¹³² U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, *Departments of Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2012*, report to accompany S. 1572, 112th Cong., 1st sess., S.Rept. 112-78 (Washington, DC: GPO, 2011), p. 6.

¹³³ U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, *Departments of Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2012*, report to accompany S. 1572, 112th Cong., 1st sess., S.Rept. 112-78 (Washington, DC: GPO, 2011), p. 108.

¹³⁴ Although these accounts exist in isolation in standard budget tables, funds from different accounts may be merged at the program level and in many cases NSF's education, facilities, and research activities are deeply integrated as a matter of practice.

increase investments in neuroscience; directing the NSF to report on its plans to offer innovation prizes and on ways to balance access to, and protection of, scientific data; and attending to the Foundation's astronomy activities, as well as its support for scientific facilities and instrumentation.¹³⁵ The Administration's FY2012 request for NSF highlighted research in cyber-infrastructure, clean energy, nanotechnology, robotics, and the SEES (Science, Engineering, and Education for Sustainability) portfolio, among others.

For EHR, P.L. 112-55 provides \$829.0 million in FY2012. This amount is equal to the Senate-passed total, \$5.2 million (0.6%) less than the House Committee on Appropriations' recommendation of \$834.2 million, \$82.2 million (9.0%) less than the President's request for \$911.2 million, and \$32.0 million (3.7%) less than the FY2011-enacted amount of \$861.0 million. P.L. 112-55 also provides at least \$54.9 million for EHR's Robert Noyce Scholarship (Noyce) program.

The Administration's FY2012 EHR request sought significant program changes in EHR accounts, including adding, altering, and terminating programs. It also reorganized the EHR directorate, including restructuring minority-serving institution programs.¹³⁶ The conference report on H.R. 2112 endorses the Administration's proposed terminations and reductions in EHR except for proposed reductions to the Math and Science Partnership and Robert Noyce Scholarship programs. It also adopts FY2011 funding levels for NSF's Broadening Participation at the Core programs (e.g., the Tribal Colleges and Universities Program), directs the NSF to report on how it will address the needs of Hispanic-Serving Institutions, provides \$20.0 more than the requested level of funding for the Federal Cyber Service: Scholarships for Service program (\$45.0 million, total), and directs the NSF to both ensure that a report on STEM education best practices is disseminated widely and to begin working on methods for tracking and evaluating the implementation of the report's recommendations. Among other things, both H.Rept. 112-169 and S.Rept. 112-78 urged the NSF to ensure that Graduate Research Fellowship program applicants are not rejected for reasons unrelated to the merits of their proposed research (e.g., an applicant's major). H.Rept. 112-169 also encouraged NSF to continue cooperating with other federal agencies in the ongoing effort to identify, coordinate, and reduce duplication in federal STEM education programs; while S.Rept. 112-78 strongly encouraged NSF to continue support for undergraduate STEM education and the Professional Science Master's program.

P.L. 112-55 provides \$167.1 million in FY2012 for MREFC. This amount is \$50.0 million (42.7%) more than the Senate-passed total of \$117.1 million, \$67.2 million (67.2%) more than the House Committee on Appropriations' recommendation of \$99.9 million, \$57.6 million (25.6%) less than the President's request for \$224.7 million, and \$50.0 million (42.7%) more than the FY2011-enacted amount of \$117.1 million. In addition, P.L. 112-55 gives the Foundation the option of transferring as much as \$50.0 million from RRA to MREFC.

The conference report on H.R. 2112 directs the NSF to prioritize MREFC projects that are near completion and raises concerns about construction funding management at the Foundation (particularly the management of contingency funds). S.Rept. 112-78 stated that its recommendation includes funding for certain ongoing projects (e.g., Atacama Large Millimeter Array) and for continued construction of the Ocean Observatories Initiative (OOI). S.Rept. 112-78 also indicated that the NSF may use funds transferred from the RRA account to fully fund OOI or begin work on NEON. H.Rept. 112-169 raised concerns about project contingency funding. The Administration's FY2012 MREFC request included funding for the National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON, \$87.9 million), OOI (\$102.8 million), and other projects. The

¹³⁵ Including selected provisions from H.Rept. 112-284, H.Rept. 112-169, and S.Rept. 112-78.

¹³⁶ Consistent with §512 of P.L. 111-358, NSF indicates that it will maintain these programs as separate programs.

Administration requested no new MREFC funds for the Alaska Region Research Vessel or IceCube Neutrino Observatory in FY2012, both of which are now fully funded.

P.L. 112-55 provides \$299.4 million for the AOAM account in FY2012. This amount is \$9.0 million (3.1%) more than the Senate-passed total of \$290.4 million, \$0.3 million (0.1%) more than the House Committee on Appropriations' recommendation of \$299.1 million, \$58.3 million (16.3%) less than the President's request for \$357.7 million, and is equal to the FY2011-enacted amount. The Administration's requested increase for AOAM included funding for a new NSF headquarters. The President also sought an increase of \$0.3 million for the NSB in FY2012. P.L. 112-55 provides \$4.4 million for this account in FY2012, 2.0% less than the FY2011-enacted level.

The Senate and the House Committee on Appropriations accepted the Administration's FY2012 NSF budget request to eliminate six NSF programs: Deep Underground Science and Engineering Laboratory, Graduate STEM Fellow in K-12 Education, National STEM Distributed Learning Program, Research Initiation Grants to Broaden Participation in Biology, Science Learning Centers, and the Synchrotron Radiation Center.

Related Agencies

The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 includes \$856.6 million for the related agencies. The FY2012 appropriation is 5.2% below the amount recommended by the Senate, but it is 5.1% more than the House Committee on Appropriation's recommendation. The amount included in the act is 13.6% below the Administration's request and 6.7% less than the FY2011 appropriation. The Senate recommended a total of \$901.1 million for the related agencies, an amount that was 10.6% more than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, but 9.1% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 1.8% less than the FY2011 appropriation. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended a total of \$814.8 million for the related agencies, an amount that was 17.8% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 11.2% less than the FY2011-enacted level. For FY2012, the Administration requested a total of \$991.4 million for the related agencies. The Administration's proposed funding was 8.0% more than the \$917.9 million Congress appropriated for the related agencies for FY2011.

Table 12. Funding for Related Agencies

(budget authority in millions of dollars)

Commission, Office, or Corporation	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Request	House Committee Reported	Senate-Passed	FY2012 Enacted
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	\$9.4	\$9.4	\$8.0	\$9.2	\$9.2
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	366.6	385.5	366.2	359.2	360.0
International Trade Commission	81.7	87.0	81.6	80.1	80.0
Legal Services Corporation	404.2	450.0	299.7	396.1	348.0
Marine Mammal Commission	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Office of the U.S. Trade Representative	47.7	51.3	51.2	51.3	51.3
State Justice Institute	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.0	5.1
Total: Related Agencies	917.9	991.4	814.8	903.9	856.6

Source: FY2011-enacted amounts, FY2012-requested amounts, and House committee-reported amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-169. Senate-passed amounts were taken from H.R. 2112, as passed by the Senate. FY2012-enacted amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-284.

Note: Amounts may not add to totals due to rounding. The House committee-reported amounts include the 0.1% rescission specified in Section 543 of H.R. 2596.

Commission on Civil Rights

Established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (the Commission)

- investigates allegations of citizens who may have been denied the right to vote based on color, race, religion, or national origin;
- studies and gathers information on legal developments constituting a denial of the equal protection of the laws;
- assesses the federal laws and policies in the area of civil rights; and
- submits reports on its findings to the President and Congress when the Commission or the President deems it appropriate.

Congress provides \$9.2 million for the Commission for FY2012. This amount is the same as the Senate's recommendation, but it is 2.5% less than the Administration's request and 2.0% less than the FY2011 appropriation. The Senate recommended \$9.2 million for the Commission, which was 15.0% more than the amount in the House committee-reported bill, but 2.5% below the Administration's request and 2.0% less than the FY2011 appropriation. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended \$8.0 million for the Commission, an amount that was 15.2% less than the Administration's request and 14.8% less than the FY2011 appropriation. The Administration requested \$9.4 million for the Commission for FY2012, which is \$48,000, or 0.5%, more than the Commission's FY2011 appropriation.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)¹³⁷

The EEOC enforces several laws that ban employment discrimination based on race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability. In the past few years, appropriators were particularly concerned about the agency's implementation of a restructuring plan, initiated in 2005, that included the creation of a National Call Center, realignment of field structure and staff, and restructuring of headquarters operations.

The FY2012 appropriation for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is \$360.0 million, which is:

- 0.2 % more than the Senate passed amount of \$359.2 million,
- 1.7 % less than the House Appropriations committee reported amount of \$366.2 million,
- 6.6% less than the Administration's FY2012 request of \$385.5 million, and
- 1.8% less than the FY2011-enacted appropriation of \$366.6 million.

The FY2012 appropriation includes \$29.5 million for payments to state and local entities (i.e., Fair Employment Practices Agencies, FEPAs, and Tribal Employment Rights Organizations, TEROs).

The Senate recommended a total appropriation of \$359.2 million the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for FY2012. The Senate recommendation was 2.0% less than the FY2011 amount of \$366.6 million, 1.9% less than the House Committee on Appropriations FY2012 recommendation of \$366.2 million, and 6.8% less than the Administration's FY2012 request of \$385.5 million. The House committee-reported amount was \$366.2 million, which was 5.0% below the Administration's request and 0.1% below the FY2011 appropriation. The Administration requested \$385.5 million for the EEOC for FY2012. The Administration's request was 5.2% greater than the FY2011 appropriation of \$366.6 million.

The conference agreement expects the EEOC to prioritize efforts for addressing the continued backlog of pending private sector charges by hiring or backfilling frontline staff positions and by examining new ways to increase productivity. The conference agreement also directs the EEOC to submit quarterly staffing reports, consistent with language in P.L. 111-117.

The EEOC projects the pending case inventory to increase from 100,000 in FY2011 to 108,000 by the end FY2012—an 8% rise.¹³⁸ According to the EEOC, the forecasted growth partly reflects the transition from a contractor-operated to an in-house call center, which allows the public to begin the charge process online. Additionally, the EEOC attributes the anticipated increase to case filings arising under recently enacted legislation such as: Title II of the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act (GINA), which became effective in November 2009; the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009; and amendments to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), which became effective in January 2009.¹³⁹

¹³⁷ This section was prepared by Abigail Rudman, Information Research Specialist, Knowledge Services Group, Domestic Social Policy Division.

¹³⁸ U.S. Congress, Senate Appropriations, *Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill 2012*, report to accompany S. 1572, 112th Cong., 1st sess., September 15, 2011, S.Rept. 112-78, p. 110 (Washington: GPO, 2011).

¹³⁹ For more information, see CRS Report RL33386, *Federal Civil Rights Statutes: A Primer*, by Jody Feder.

The EEOC federal sector hearings workload is estimated to increase from 7,164 pending hearings in FY2010 to 7,950 in FY2012, a 11% increase.¹⁴⁰ The Commission continues to implement technology initiatives to support the federal sector program.

U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC)¹⁴¹

The ITC is an independent, quasi-judicial agency established by Congress that advises the President and Congress on U.S. foreign economic policies. In its *Strategic Plan* for 2009-2014, the ITC identified the following five strategic operations, which define the functions of the agency: (1) import injury investigations, (2) intellectual property-based imports investigations, (3) industry and economic analysis, (4) tariff and trade information services, and (5) trade policy support.¹⁴² As a matter of policy, its budget request is submitted to Congress by the President without revision.

The FY2012-enacted amount for ITC is \$80.0 million. This amount is 0.1% less than the Senate recommendation, 2.0% less than the House recommendation, 8.0% less than the Administration's FY2012 request, and 2.1% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. The Senate recommended \$80.1 million for ITC. The Senate-recommended amount was 1.9% less than the House Committee on Appropriations recommended amount of \$81.6 million. The Senate-recommendation would have been 8.0% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 2.0% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. The FY2012 budget request for ITC was \$87.0 million, a \$5.3 million (6.5%) increase from the FY2011-enacted appropriation of \$81.7 million. The budget request stated that the requested increase in the budget was driven largely by increases in salaries, benefits, and rent costs.

Legal Services Corporation (LSC)¹⁴³

The LSC is a private, nonprofit, federally funded corporation that provides grants to local offices that, in turn, provide legal assistance to low-income people in civil (noncriminal) cases. The LSC has been controversial since its incorporation in the early 1970s and has been operating without authorizing legislation since 1980. There have been ongoing debates over the adequacy of funding for the agency and the extent to which certain types of activities are appropriate for federally funded legal aid attorneys to undertake. In annual appropriations bills, Congress traditionally has included legislative provisions restricting the activities of LSC-funded grantees, such as prohibiting any lobbying activities or prohibiting representation in certain types of cases.

Although the authorization of appropriations for the LSC expired at the end of FY1980, the LSC has operated for the past 31 years under annual appropriations laws. The LSC was funded at \$404.2 million for FY2011, which surpassed the LSC's previous highest funding level of \$400.0 million in FY1994 and FY1995. For FY2012, the LSC is funded at \$348 million.

The FY2012-enacted amount for the LSC is \$348 million. This amount is 12.1% less than the amount recommended by the Senate, 16.1% more than the House Committee on Appropriation recommendation, 22.7% less than the Administration's FY2012 budget request, and 13.9% less

¹⁴⁰ FY2012 Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Congressional Budget Justification, Table 7. Federal Sector Hearings Workload, http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/plan/2012budget.cfm#_Toc282609550

¹⁴¹ This section was written by M. Angeles Villarreal, Specialist in International Trade and Finance, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

¹⁴² U.S. Office of Management and Budget, *The President's Budget Fiscal Year 2012 Appendix, Other Independent Agencies, U.S. International Trade Commission*, p. 1249.

¹⁴³ This section was prepared by Carmen Solomon-Fears, Specialist in Social Policy, Domestic Social Policy Division.

than the FY2011-enacted amount. The FY2012 appropriation for the LSC includes \$322.4 million for basic field programs and required independent audits, \$17.0 million for management and grants oversight, \$3.4 million for client self-help and information technology, \$4.2 million for the Office of the Inspector General, and \$1.0 million for loan repayment assistance. All existing restrictions on LSC activities would still be in effect. The conference report conferees urged that the LSC continue to encourage the involvement of private attorneys in the delivery of pro bono services to its clients. The conferees also directed the LSC to conduct a study of the implementation and costs of a legal aid fellowship program that would provide incentives for retirees and/or recent law school graduates to commit to working in legal services programs for a specified period of time. The LSC is required to report the findings of the study to the Committees on Appropriations no later than March 17, 2012 (i.e., 120 days after enactment). In addition, the conferees encouraged the LSC Inspector General to conduct annual audits of LSC grantees to make sure that they are not using LSC funds in violation of the prohibition against engaging in political activities or any of the other restrictions on LSC activities. The conferees recommended that funds be withdrawn from any LSC grantee found engaging in political activity.

For FY2012, the Senate recommended \$396.1 million for the LSC. This amount is 32.2% more than the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriation, 12.0% less than the Administration's FY2012 budget request, and 2.0% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. The Senate's recommendation for the LSC for FY2012 included \$370.5 million for basic field programs and required independent audits, \$17.0 million for management and grants oversight, \$3.4 million for client self-help and information technology, \$4.2 million for the Office of the Inspector General, and \$1.0 million for loan repayment assistance. The Senate Committee on Appropriations (1) directed the LSC to continue its collaboration with the Department of Justice to conduct a national study of the cost-effectiveness of a legal services program patterned after existing state models; (2) encouraged the LSC to have its grantees improve and/or increase private attorney pro bono participation; and (3) directed LSC to conduct a study of the implementation and costs of a legal aid fellowship program that would provide incentives for retirees and/or recent law school graduates to commit to working in legal services programs for a specified period of time. The committee also recommended that all the restrictions on the use of *private funds* for the LSC, except those associated with abortion-related cases, be eliminated. The restrictions on the use of public funds for the LSC would remain in effect.

For FY2012, the House Committee on Appropriations recommended \$299.7 million for the LSC. This amount is 33.4% less than the Administration's FY2012 budget request and 25.9% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. The committee also encouraged the LSC Inspector General to conduct annual audits of LSC grantees to make sure that they are not using LSC funds in violation of the prohibition against engaging in political activities or any of the other restrictions on LSC activities. The committee recommended that funds be withdrawn from any LSC grantee found engaging in political activity.

For FY2012, the Obama Administration requested \$450.0 million for the LSC. This amount is \$45.8 million (11.3%) above the FY2011 appropriation of \$404.2 million for the LSC. The Administration's FY2012 budget request included \$420.2 million for basic field programs and required independent audits, \$19.5 million for management and grants oversight, \$5.0 million for client self-help and information technology, \$4.4 million for the Office of the Inspector General, and \$1.0 million for loan repayment assistance. The Obama Administration also proposed that LSC restrictions on class action suits and attorneys' fees be eliminated.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁴ The restriction on attorneys' fees was eliminated pursuant to P.L. 111-117. For further information see CRS Report R40679, *Legal Services Corporation: Restrictions on Activities*, by Carmen Solomon-Fears.

Marine Mammal Commission (MMC)¹⁴⁵

The Marine Mammal Commission is an independent agency of the executive branch, established under Title II of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA; P.L. 92-522). The Marine Mammal Commission (MMC) and its Committee of Scientific Advisors on Marine Mammals provide oversight and recommend actions on domestic and international topics to advance policies and provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act. As funding permits, the Marine Mammal Commission supports research to further the purposes of the MMPA.

Congress provided \$3.0 million for the MMC for FY2012, concurring with the Senate-passed amount and the Administration's FY2012 request. FY2012 funding is 0.1% more than the House Committee on Appropriations recommended amount for FY2012 and it represents a 6.7% reduction compared to FY2011-enacted funding of \$3.2 million. The Senate recommended amount for the MMC was the same as the Administration's FY2012 request and 6.7% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended amount for the MMC was 0.1% less than the Administration's FY2012 request and 6.8% less than the FY2011-enacted amount. The Administration's FY2012 request for the MMC was \$3.0 million, which would have represented a 6.7% reduction compared to FY2011-enacted funding of \$3.2 million.

Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR)¹⁴⁶

The USTR, located in the Executive Office of the President, is responsible for developing and coordinating U.S. international trade and direct investment policies. The USTR is the President's chief negotiator for international trade agreements, including commodity and direct investment negotiations. USTR also conducts U.S. affairs related to the World Trade Organization.

The FY2012-enacted amount for USTR is \$51.3 million. This amount is the same as the Administration's request and the Senate recommended amount, and 0.1% less than the House-recommended amount. The enacted amount is \$3.5 million, or 7.4%, more than the FY2011 funding level of \$47.7 million. The Senate recommended \$51.3 million for USTR, which was 0.1% less than the House Committee on Appropriations recommended amount of \$51.2 million. The Senate recommendation would have been the same as the Administration's FY2012 request and 7.4% more than the FY2011-enacted amount of \$47.7 million. The FY2012 budget request was \$51.3 million, a \$3.5 million (7.4%) increase from the FY2011 funding level. The President's budget request stated that the requested increase reflected the need for additional staffing and travel requirements to achieve critical U.S. trade initiatives and negotiations, as well as to support the cost escalation in overseas operations and federal protective services.¹⁴⁷

State Justice Institute (SJI)

The SJI is a nonprofit corporation that makes grants to state courts and funds research, technical assistance, and informational projects aimed at improving the quality of judicial administration in state courts across the United States. It is governed by an 11-member board of directors appointed

¹⁴⁵ This section was prepared by Eugene H. Buck, Specialist in Natural Resources Policy; Resources, Science, and Industry Division.

¹⁴⁶ This section was written by M. Angeles Villarreal, Specialist in International Trade and Finance, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

¹⁴⁷ Executive Office of the President, *Fiscal Year 2012 Congressional Budget Submission*, p. EPO-6.

by the President and confirmed by the Senate.¹⁴⁸ Under the terms of its enabling legislation, SJI is authorized to present its budget request directly to Congress, apart from the President's budget. For FY2012, SJI will receive an appropriation of \$5.1 million, which is 2.0% more than the Senate's mark, 0.1% more than the House committee-recommendation, and the same as the FY2011 appropriation. However, this amount is 0.2% less than the FY2012 request. The Senate recommended \$5.0 million for SJI, an amount that was 1.9% below the House Committee on Appropriation's mark, 2.2% less than the request and 2.0% less than the FY2011 appropriation. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended \$5.1 million for SJI for FY2012. The committee-reported amount was 0.3% less than the FY2012 request and 0.1% less than the FY2011-enacted appropriation. The FY2012 request for SJI was \$5.1 million. The request is \$10,000 more than the FY2011 appropriation for SJI.

¹⁴⁸ By law, the President must appoint six state court judges, one state court administrator, and four members of the public, no more than two of whom may be of the same political party.

Table 13. Funding for CJS Agencies, by Account, FY2008-FY2012

(budget authority in millions of dollars)

Bureau or Agency	FY2008 Enacted	FY2009 Enacted	FY2010 Enacted	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Enacted
Department of Commerce					
International Trade Administration	\$405.2	\$420.4	\$446.8	\$440.7	\$455.6
Bureau of Industry and Security	72.9	83.7	100.3	100.1	101.0
Economic Development Administration	779.9	312.8 ^a	293.0	283.4	457.5
Minority Business Development Agency	28.6	29.8	31.5	30.3	30.3
Economic and Statistical Analysis	81.1	90.6	97.2	97.1	96.0
Bureau of the Census	1,440.2	3,139.9 ^b	7,324.7	1,149.7	888.3
National Telecommunications and Information Administration	36.3	39.2 ^c	40.0	41.6	45.6
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office	1,915.5	2,010.1	2,016.0	2,090.0	2,706.3
Offsetting Fee Receipts USPTO	-1,915.5	-2,087.0	-1,887.0	-2,090.0	-2,706.3
National Institute of Standards and Technology	755.8	819.0 ^d	856.6	750.1	750.8
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	3,988.5	4,365.2 ^e	4,737.5	4,588.0	4,893.7
Departmental Management	70.0	83.8 ^f	107.5	99.8	88.9
DOC Subtotal	7,658.5	9,307.5	14,164.2^g	7,580.9	7,807.7
Department of Justice					
General Administration	1,798.8	2,067.8	2,276.7	2,208.1	2,227.9
General Administration	257.6	370.8	456.9	312.2	262.1
Administrative Review & Appeals	240.6	266.0	296.7	296.1	301.0
Detention Trustee	1,225.9	1,355.3	1,438.7	1,515.6	1,580.6
Office of the Inspector General	74.8	75.7 ^h	84.4	84.2	84.2
U.S. Parole Commission	11.5	12.6	12.9	12.8	12.8
Legal Activities	2,724.1	2,918.2	3,085.2	3,177.3	3,187.2
General legal activities	747.2	805.7	875.1	863.4	863.4
United States Attorneys	1,759.8	1,851.3	1,934.0	1,930.1	1,960.0
Other ⁱ	217.1	261.2	276.1	383.8	363.8
U.S. Marshals Service	895.1	964.0	1,152.4	1,140.1	1,189.0
National Security Division	73.4	85.2	87.9	87.8	87.0
Interagency Law Enforcement	497.9	515.0	528.6	527.5	527.5
Federal Bureau of Investigation	6,763.8	7,336.2	7,898.5	7,926.3	8,118.0
Drug Enforcement Administration	1,887.4	1,959.1	2,019.7	2,015.6	2,035.0
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms & Explosives	1,011.6	1,068.2	1,120.8	1,112.5	1,152.0
Federal Prison System	5,612.6	6,178.9	6,188.1	6,384.1	6,644.0
Office of Violence Against Women	400.0	415.0 ^j	418.5	417.7	412.5
Office of Justice Programs	1,694.8	2,066.6	2,283.5	1,697.9	1,616.3
Justice Assistance	196.2	220.0	235.0	234.5	113.0

Bureau or Agency	FY2008 Enacted	FY2009 Enacted	FY2010 Enacted	FY2011 Enacted	FY2012 Enacted
State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance	1,008.1	1,328.5 ^k	1,534.8	1,117.8	1,162.5
Weed and Seed	32.1	25.0	20.0	—	—
Juvenile Justice Programs	383.5	374.0	423.6	275.4	262.5
Public Safety Officers Benefits	74.8	119.1	70.1	70.1	78.3
Community Oriented Policing Services	857.2	550.5 ^l	791.6	494.9	198.5
OVW, OJP, and COPS Salaries and Expenses	—	195.0 ^m	213.4	186.6	—
DOJ Subtotal	23,958.3	26,332.3	28,077.7ⁿ	27,389.2	27,407.7
Science Agencies					
Office of Science and Technology Policy	5.2	5.3	7.0	6.6	4.5
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	17,401.9	17,782.4 ^o	18,724.3	18,448.0	17,800.0
National Science Foundation	6,127.5	6,490.4 ^p	6,926.5	6,859.9	7,033.1
Science Agencies Subtotal	23,534.6	24,278.1	25,657.8	25,314.5	24,837.6
Related Agencies					
Commission on Civil Rights	8.5	8.8	9.4	9.4	\$2
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)	329.3	343.9	367.3	366.6	360.0
International Trade Commission	68.4	75.1	81.9	81.7	80.0
Legal Services Corporation	350.5	390.0	420.0	404.2	348.0
Marine Mammal Commission	2.8	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.0
National Veterans Business Development Corporation	1.4	—	—	—	—
U.S. Trade Representative	44.1	47.3	47.8	47.7	51.3
State Justice Institute	3.8	4.1	5.1	5.1	5.1
Related Agencies Subtotal	808.8	872.4	934.8	917.9	856.6
Total Appropriations	55,960.1^q	60,790.3^r	68,834.5^s	61,202.5^t	60,909.6^u
American Recovery and Reinvestment Act	—	15,922.0	—	—	—

Source: FY2008-enacted amounts taken from the House Committee on Appropriations' Committee Print on the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 (P.L. 111-8), Division B. FY2009-enacted amounts taken from H.Rept. 111-366. FY2010-enacted amounts were taken from S.Rept. 111-229. FY2011-enacted amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-169. FY2012-enacted amounts were taken from H.Rept. 112-284.

Note: Amounts may not add to totals due to rounding.

- This amount does not include the \$150.0 million that the Economic Development Administration received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5).
- This amount does not include the \$1.0 billion that the Census Bureau received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5).
- This amount does not include the \$5.4 billion that the National Telecommunication and Information Administration received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5).
- This amount does not include the \$580.0 million that the National Institute of Standards and Technology received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (P.L. 111-5).
- This amount does not include the \$830.0 million that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5).
- This amount does not include the \$6.0 million that the Office of the Inspector General received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5).

- g. This amount does not include \$105.0 million in supplemental funding for the Department of Commerce (P.L. 111-212 and P.L. 111-224), of which \$54.0 million was for the Economic Development Administration and \$51.0 million was for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. However, it does include \$129.0 in supplemental funding for the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office,
- h. This amount does not include the \$2.0 million that the Office of the Inspector General received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5).
- i. "Other" includes subaccounts for the Antitrust Division, Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund, U.S. Trustee System Fund, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Fees and Expenses of Witnesses, Community Relations Service, and the Asset Forfeiture Fund.
- j. This amount does not include the \$225.0 million that the Office on Violence Against Women received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5).
- k. This amount does not include the \$2.765 billion appropriated for the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance account under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5).
- l. This amount does not include the \$1.0 billion the Community Oriented Policing Services Office received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5).
- m. This amount does not include the \$10.0 million appropriated for OVW, OJP, and COPS Salaries and Expenses under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5).
- n. This amount does not include \$206.0 million in supplemental funding for the Department of Justice (P.L. 111-212 and P.L. 111-230), of which \$2.1 million was for Administrative Review and Appeals; \$7.0 million was for the Office of the Federal Detention Trustee; \$13.9 million was for General Legal Activities; \$9.2 was for the U.S. Attorneys; \$37.7 million was for the U.S. Marshals; \$21.0 million was for Interagency Law Enforcement; \$24.0 million was for the Federal Bureau of Investigation; \$33.7 million was for the Drug Enforcement Administration; \$37.5 million was for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives; and \$20.0 million was for the Federal Prison System.
- o. This amount does not include the \$1.002 billion the National Aeronautics and Space Administration received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5).
- p. This amount does not include the \$3.002 billion the National Science Foundation received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5).
- q. This amount does not include \$901.8 million in rescissions of unobligated balances.
- r. This amount does not include \$610.6 million in rescissions of unobligated balances.
- s. This amount does not include \$531.2 million in rescissions of unobligated balances included in P.L. 111-117; \$111.5 million in rescissions of unobligated balances included in P.L. 111-212; \$129.0 million in rescissions of unobligated balances included in P.L. 111-224; and \$1.788 billion in rescissions of unobligated balances included in P.L. 112-6.
- t. This amount does not include \$2.416 billion in rescissions of unobligated balances.
- u. This amount does not include \$905.9 million in rescissions of unobligated balances.

Author Information

Nathan James, Coordinator
Analyst in Crime Policy

M. Angeles Villarreal
Specialist in International Trade and Finance

Jennifer D. Williams, Coordinator
Specialist in American National Government

Daniel Morgan
Specialist in Science and Technology Policy

John F. Sargent Jr., Coordinator
Specialist in Science and Technology Policy

Heather B. Gonzalez
Specialist in Science and Technology Policy

William J. Krouse
Specialist in Domestic Security and Crime Policy

Eugene Boyd
Analyst in Federalism and Economic Development
Policy

Kristin M. Finklea
Specialist in Domestic Security

Dana A. Shea
Specialist in Science and Technology Policy

Ian F. Fergusson
Specialist in International Trade and Finance

Eugene H. Buck
Specialist in Natural Resources Policy

Harold F. Upton
Analyst in Natural Resources Policy

Abigail B. Rudman
Information Research Specialist

Linda K. Moore
Specialist in Telecommunications Policy

Carmen Solomon-Fears
Specialist in Social Policy

Wendy H. Schacht
Specialist in Science and Technology Policy

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.